THE

MALABAR QUARTERLY REVIEW.

EDITED BY

K. N. SIVARAJAN, R. A.

Vol. VIII] DECEMBER, 1909 [No. 4.

REPRESENTATIVE GOVERNMENT FOR INDIA.

By Mr. N. K. Ramaswamy Aiya, B. A., B. L.

REPRESENTATIVE Government for India is the sole panacea for all her political ills. The growth during recent years of a feeling of common nationality, based upon common traditions, common disabilities and common hopes and aspirations, has been most striking. The fact that we are Indians first, and Hindus, Mahomedans, Parsees or Christians afterwards is being realized in a steadily increasing measure and the idea of a united and renovated India, marching onwards to a place among the nations of the world, worthy of her great past, is no longer a mere idle dream, but is the definitely accepted creed of the educated people. All classes of people are slowly but steadily coming under the influence of liberal ideas. The claims of public life are everyday receiving wider recognition. Self-Government is our goal.

There are two theories of Government advanced by political science. The first theory is the naturalistic or mechanical and the second, teleological. According to the first theory, political institutions are considered to be natural growths. According to the second, they are considered to be made by man for certain ends in view. Neither of the theories contains the whole truth. While on the one hand, the natural tendencies of society must be taken greatly into consideration it cannot be denied that they may be largely modified by human endeavour.

In considering what form of Government is applicable to a particular society, it must be first considered what its natural tendency is. In India it is towards a monarchical government. There is no doubt much to be said in favour of this government. If a king is good and sympathetic, this form of government will be advantageous to a community. That the tendency in India is towards monarchical government is clear from the respect and adoration that the people of this country generally have towards the king, whom they even consider to be a divine incarnation. The indifference of the Hindu to any particular form of government is evident from the proverb. "What care we if Rama rules or Ravana rules." This is due to the fact of his entire resignation of all his interests to sovereign authority. Rarely does a Hindu trouble himself with the affairs of government. The Hindu ideal of monarchical government is a high one, formed from the lives of ideal kings like Rama, who were true heroes and who took great pains to subdue the barbarians who opposed the tide of civilization and restored good government to the people. A monarchical government is good so long as the king is not actuated by personal considerations and looks to the interests of the people. But such a state of things cannot continue long. The same king may not always be moved by the same considerations, and we may not have a succession of equally good kings. Again, when a foreign government rules a country, it is likely that there may be a conflict of interests. This alters the position greatly. The centre of gravity has now to be shifted with a view to attain a new equilibrium. We have therefore to consider what the best form of government is, under the altered circumstances of India. Changes cannot however be introduced all at once. A country which has been accustomed for a long time to particular modes of thought cannot be expected to change them suddenly. There are three conditions, or more properly speaking, three aids and facilities for change. They are, firstly, the people must be willing to accept the change. This is not a difficult condition. The very love of novelty which is inherent in the human mind will greatly induce people to change. Further, the fact that a particular form of government is adopted by the civilized nations of the world and has been of great benefit to the people is likely to be an additional factor in inducing a people to change. The second condition is that the people must be willing and able to do what is necessary to keep a new form of government. This too is not a difficult condition. It is rarely that there is a necessity for the people to exert in the direction. They have to exercise their mind only

occasionally and at other times they can attend to their own work. The third condition is that the people must be willing and able to do what the new form of government requires of them. This implies that people must have a knowledge of their political affairs and must take an intelligent interest in them. If people are indifferent to their own affairs and do not act with full consciousness of their responsibilities and are ever under the influence of others, they cannot be considered to be fit for a better form of government. Here lies the important work of the educated men of the country whose duty it is to bring the people in touch with the improved notions which they have derived from their studies. If only the people are properly educated in this direction they will soon take an active interest in their affairs and be able to fulfil what is expected of them. People can be made to acknowledge the merits of a better form of government if a strong opinion is created in favour of it. It must be the aim of every educated man to bring about a consensus of feeling in the matter, for, on it depends the political salvation of the country.

But it may be asked whether it is possible to change the present condition of things. It is often argued that any efforts on the part of the people will be fruitless to change the present system government. There is not much force in this argument, though it may appear to be superficially sound. It is not physical power that constitutes the strength of a government. It is the moral power that sustains the government and this moral power is greatly contributed to by the intelligent acceptance by the nation of the principles of government. A discontented people are not likely to be a real support to a government. Representative government is not altogether new to the people of this country. The Village Panchayats of old were the primitive form and the nucleus of the Representative Government that we now find in the most advanced countries of the world. Such a simple and purely local form of Representative Government is not possible now in the altered conditions of society Our interests have greatly widened, our geographical limits much extended and there are by far more numerous elements to be brought together under the same form of Representative Government.

The great evil and obstacle in the way of Representative Government is the feeling of rivalry and jealousy which characterizes the majority of the people. The spirit of sacrifice of the self to the good of the many is not new to our people. Only, that spirit is absent at present. But there are signs of an awakening throughout the country

Unless one is willing to be represented by another and is not anxious to be himself the representative and unless one is prepared to yield to the will of the majority, no proper Representative Government is possible. It is the lack of this spirit that is the fruitful cause of the factions and quarrels that are often observed in our representative institutions. But with proper education things are bound to change.

The functions of government are two-fold, obligatory and optional. The former may be styled statical, as they tend to preserve order and the latter dynamical, as they tend to progress. Under the former may be included the measures adopted for the preservation of order, protection of person and property from violence and robbery, regulation of the holding, transmission and interchange of property, including enforcement of contracts, punishment of crime, administration of justice and civil causes and preservation from external danger. Under the optional duties are included regulation of trade and industry, regulation of labour, maintenance of thoroughfares, maintenance of post and telegraphic systems, sanitation, education, intellectual and political, and care of the poor.

The chief duty of government is to enable the people to ascend a higher step towards progress. In the words of Mill, the indispensable merit of government in favor of which may be forgiven almost any amount of other demerit compatible with progress is that its operation on the people is favorable or not unfavorable to the next step which it is necessary for them to take in order to raise themselves to a higher level.

The people of the world may be divided into three classes, namely, people in a stage of savage independence, in which every one lives for himself, the next higher class of people who have passed the savage stage, but who are averse to continuous labour of an unexciting kind, and civilized nations who are able to manage their own affairs themselves. With reference to the first class of people they have to be taught to obey. The second class of people are those who have learnt to obey. But they require guidance. The government suitable to this class is the government of leading strings. But the government of leading strings must enable the people to walk unaided. The question now to be considered is whether we are fit for the next stage, viz., that of Representative Government as it obtains among the civilized nations of the world. The country seems to be ripe for the third stage. It cannot be denied that we have still some shortcomings. But it

must be said that the liberal education that we have received, the political knowledge that we now have, the growing interest that is evinced by our people in public affairs and the spirit of national unification that now dominates the people, all these signs show that the people are fit now for Representative Government. Further we have already to some extent been trained in minor forms of it in our representative bodies. A good and far-sighted father looks anxiously for the day when his son would be in a position to manage his own affairs. The merit of a father lies in training his son for that end. Such also is the duty of a civilized government. To say that more than a century of British rule has not trained us in this direction is to cast a slur on the government itself. The people of this country have now arrived at a stage to be led on by the government to the next higher stage, that of the civilized nations of the world.

Representative Government is admittedly the ideal form of government and is the one adopted by all the advanced nations of the world. It must be the endeavour of every civilized government to lead its people to this ideal stage. It is contended by some that we are not yet fit for this. But there are on the other hand an equally respectable array of statesmen who take the contrary view. One does not learn liberty unless liberty is granted to him. The argument of those who think that unless we are thoroughly fit for Representative Government, we ought not to be given it, is like the argument that unless one knows how to swim, he ought not to get into water. But just as unless one gets into water he cannot learn to swim, so we should be given at the present stage the higher form of Representative Government to train us in it and make us in the end fit for it to the full extent. Representative Government is the ideally best polity. There are three forms of Government: Monarchical, Aristocratic and Democratic. In the monarchical form, the king is all powerful. This form of government is good as long as the king is sympathetic. In monarchy the king has to be all-seeing. This is often impossible. Further it is not likely that because one king is good, there will be a succession of good kings. Success in lottery is no argument for lottery. In a monarchy the king thinks for all and the people do not trouble themselves about their affairs. In the words of Mill, a person must have a very nominal taste for intellectual exercise in and for itself, who will put himself to the trouble of thought when it is to have no outward effect or qualify himself for functions which he has no chance of being allowed to exercise. Besides affecting intellectually, moral

capacities become stunted in this form of government. When the king goes wrong, people naturally consider their evils as visitations of nature. Lastly in such a form of government there is no security against foreign invasion as the people have no interest in their affairs and they are indifferent as to who rules them. The fate of India is significant. The people of this country have passed quite indifferently under different foreign nations, the Greeks, the Persians, the Mahomedans, the Moghuls and the Europeans. A people who quietly submit themselves to any government are wanting in the enlightened self-interest of the economists. The second form of government, viz., the aristocratic, though better in some respects than the monarchical, has its own faults. This government suffers from class interests. The upper classes have their own interests which often clash with those of the lower. However sincere one may be, it is quite natural that when his interests are in question his hands cannot be tied up. The true theory of political institutions is that each man is the best judge of his own affairs. Aristocratic government on the other hand implies that others can equally well judge of one's affairs which is against experience. The best form of government is the democratic or the Representative. This is the ideally best polity. Mill says that the ideally best form of government is that in which the sovereignty or supreme controlling power in the last resort is vested in the entire aggregate of the community, every citizen not only having a voice in the exercise of that ultimate sovereignty, but being at least occasionally called on to take an actual part in the government by the personal discharge of some public function, local or general.

There are two classes of temperament, the active and the passive. The Hindus generally belong to the passive type. The active is however the better type. It is only after the contact with western civilization that the Hindus are better recognizing the value of the active type. As it has been rightly put the West has to infuse into its civilization something of the Oriental passive type and vice versa. The highest ideal of the passive type is placid serenity, while according to the active type growth of new wants is beneficial as it stimulates people to increased exertion. The passive type does not care for abundance of good, but is satisfied with paucity of wants. There is one danger in the active type which must be guarded against. It must not be forgotten that working is for life and not life for working. Nevertheless the active type should be the model for us all. All improvement of human affairs is wholly the work of the active type. Success

in life is the fruit of exertion and not of the passive temperament which believes in fatality or accident. In the passive type success in politics falls to its lowest point. All the advanced nations of the world belong to the active type and it is they that have made the world better. Inactivity, absence of desire and unaspiringness, which are the characteristics of the passive type are fatal to improvement. The passive temperament leads to selfishness and the active temperament to altruistic work. The government of many promotes the active type, while that of the one or the few promotes the passive type.

These considerations show that the representative form of government is an ideally best polity. The growing recognition of the active type by our people shows their increasing fitness for Representative Government. As Mill puts it, it is a great discouragement to an individual and a still greater one to a class to be left out of the constitution, to be reduced to plead from outside the door to the arbiters of their destiny and not taken into consultation within.

There are certain obstacles to Representative Government, which we have to consider. The first obstacle is that the people must have learnt obedience. As regards this the people of this country have passed that stage. Even this spirit of obedience when carried too far becomes an obstacle. Extreme passiveness is as great an obstacle as the absence of obedience. As already said our people are now showing signs of activity. The other impediment is the spirit of locality. Local interests must give way to national interests. This is being brought about by our several national movements. We perceive greater solidarity everywhere now.

In a Representative Government the ultimate power must be in the hands of the people. It is a maxim admitted by all that there must be no taxation without representation.

The chief function of the representative assembly is to control and advise the government. The executive must be in the hands of trained men. So also the power of initiating the laws. It is not possible for a large assembly of people to have the training and expert knowledge necessary for the Executive and the Legislative work.

The representative assembly must also be the nation's committee of grievances and its Congress of opinions. It is often said that representative assemblies are mere places of talk. Mill says that there has seldom been more misplaced derision and that they cannot more usefully employ themselves than in talk when the subject of talk is

the great public interest of the country. He adds that a place where every interest or shade of opinion in the country can have its cause even passionately pleaded in the face of the government and of all other interests and opinions and can compel them to listen and either comply or state clearly why they do not, is, in itself, if it answered no other purpose, one of the most important political institutions, that can exist anywhere and one of the foremost benefits of free government. Talking and not doing is the proper business of representative assemblies. Doing is the work of individuals especially trained in it. Representative assemblies have simply to see that such individuals are honestly and intelligently chosen and to interfere no further with them except by the unlimited latitude of suggestion and criticism.

The defects of Representative government are either negative or positive, The negative defects are two in number. The first is jealousy of the power of the Executive. Jealousy will cease if proper men are appointed. Further, experience and education may teach people not to meddle with the Excutive too much. The second negative defect is the not bringing out of individual faculties. As much political education must be given as possible. The positive evils of representative government are general ignorance and class interests. It is not true to say that popular government is defective in knowledge, for capable men are available. A representative assembly requires only mental competency sufficient for superintendence and check. The second positive evil of representative government is class interests or sinister interests. This leads them to tax heavily, to possess unlimited power over the people, to permit no censure of themselves, to be all themselves above others and to foment discontent among the people in order to prevent them from being well off, lest they should wax fat and kick. The above evil prevails largely at present in India. It is human nature to be dominated by such class interests. Distant and not immediate interest must be considered. But human nature looks to the latter generally. It is unwise to think that ordinary men will look to distant or real interests, when all their emotional and intellectual forces impel them to follow apparent or immediate interests.

A real danger of democracy is that, if people are in power, they might clamour for things which might ruin their distant interests. These evils may be avoided if the parties are so well balanced that there will always be a majority for the proper course of action. But this danger is harmless in India, for the dominant class and the people

can easily maintain the balance. The danger is no doubt real in a pure democracy. It is not so here. The different castes of the Hindus, the different nationalities in this country, the dominant governing class who are foreigners maintain among themselves the above balance. All interests are equally balanced in India. Hence class interests cannot easily prevail here. It is not possible for any one class of people to advance their own interests in such a state of things. If the ideal of Representative Government is to succeed, it will best succeed only in India and not in any other part of the world, for nowhere are the different classes so equally balanced. It is hoped that Representative Government will under these favourable conditions reach its ideal perfection in India.

It is an essential part of democracy that minorities should be adequately represented. No real democracy, nothing but a false show of democracy, is possible without it. Mill says that a representative democracy, representative of all and not solely of the majority in which the interests, the opinions, the grade of intellect, which are outnumbered would nevertheless be heard, should have a chance of obtaining by weight of character, of strength, of argument, an influence which would not belong to their universal force. This democracy which alone is equal, alone impartial, alone the Government of all by all, the only true type of democracy would be free from the greatest evils of the falsely called democracies which now prevail and from which the current idea of democracy is exclusively derived. Every eligible man must have a voice in the representation. There ought to be no pariahs in a full grown and civilized nation, no persons disqualified except through their own default. It is universal and not limited suffrage that is conducive to the best interests of society. Every one is degraded whether aware of it or not, when other people without consulting him take upon themselves unlimited power to regulate his destiny. Though every one has a right to be represented, all must not have equal voice. Those that are educated and have better political training must have a plurality of voice. The doctrine that any one man is as good as another is a false creed fraught with mischievous consequences. It is not desirable to delegate the power of election. An absence of direct responsibility to the people has a demoralizing effect on the people as well as their representatives. Open and not secret voting is desirable in public institutions. In public bodies it is not the mere wish of the voter that has to be considered but the public have an interest in his vote. They have a right to know

whom he elects. The vote in a public body is not a favour to be bestowed on another, but a duty to be discharged towards the public. The term that a representative should serve must neither be too short nor too long. Full freedom must be allowed to the representatives to do what they think proper. If not, the public will lose the advantage of the superior intelligence of the representatives. The elite of the country, men of experience in various departments, statesmen and men of political education must find place in the Representative assemblies.

The representative assembly is to advise and not to appoint the Executive. The Executive must rest in one man, otherwise there will be no responsibility. As central bodies cannot attend to petty and local matters, local representative bodies are necessary. Though local bodies can better attend to local affairs they must be controlled by the central body otherwise the local bodies will run riot. The central body must have a general control over the local bodies and it must attend to the general principles that must guide both itself and the local bodies. The central government must supervise local affairs though they may not primarily deal with them. A government which attempts to do everything may be compared to a schoolmaster who does all the pupils' tasks for them. He may be very popular with the pupils, but he will teach them little.

A portion of mankind, says Mill, may be said to constitute a nationality, if they are united among themselves by common sympathies which do not exist between them and any others which make them co-operate with each other more willingly than with other people, desire to be under the same government by them and desire that it should be government by themselves or a portion of themselves exclusively. The causes that generally conduce to a feeling of nationality are common religion, language and history. Religion is being rationalized now in such a manner as not to divide one class of people from another. All the various religions of the world are being harmonized at present. Religion, as thus seen, views the whole universe as an organic whole which represents God. In this organic unity, it is clear that all our activities must blend together harmoniously, for no part of the organic whole can be separated from the rest. As regards language, English is now becoming the common language of the people. Men of different religious persuasions and languages are now combined together for considering their common political grievances. Though our past history may not be common, still we have had a

common history since the Proclamation. Further the fact that our political interests and aspirations are the same has of late produced in us a feeling of nationality, without which free institutions are impossible. This feeling of nationality is bound to grow in strength as time passes on. It is only a people of political capacity that can form themselves into a strong nationality. There is no juster cause of resistance than the defence of nationality. Every nation has a right to exist and to have its language, literature, customs and traditions maintained. The absorption of the different races of India is out of the question, but their angularities may be greatly softened. It is quite essential that the soldiers in the country must also feel one with the people, for otherwise they will take arms against their own countrymen in time of war, as they did in India in the past. Mill rightly says that though in a barbarous state of society, the government may be interested in softening the antipathies of the races that place may be preserved and the country more easily governed, yet when there are either free institutions or a desire for them in any of the peoples artificially tied together, the government is interested in keeping up and encouraging their antipathies that they may be prevented from coalescing and it may be enabled to use some of them as tools for the enslavement of others. There are, happily, signs at present that improvement is too far advanced to permit this policy to be any longer successful.

Federal representative government is sometimes the preliminary to true Representative Government. A temporary union of States is not a federal government, for it has no central authority to enforce its opinions on the States. The Native States of India under the suzerainty of British Government correspond roughly to federal representative government. The final political consummation will be a universal state in which the whole world will form a single federal government. Mill truly says that the government of a people by itself has a meaning and a reality, but such a thing as government of one people by another does not and cannot exist. Every government must have, as its ideal, perfect independence. The only form of government which is conducive to the real welfare of India is one in which it has perfect freedom in its government. The goal of India is self-government. Real good government, says Mill, is not compatible with the conditions of the case, and there can but be a choice of im. perfections. In the words of Mill, one people may keep another as a warren or preserve for its own use, a place to make money in, a

human cattle farm, to be worked for the profit of its own inhabitants, but the government of a people by itself has alone a meaning and a reality.

India's political salvation lies in Representative Government. The new India chafes under its present abject condition under a policy of foreign destructive despotism and aspires to higher and pressing aims, aims of self-government. India will prosper by self-government. The worst of all tyrannies is the tyranny of a nation over a nation. The most pressing problem now is self-government. We must inspire the people of India at large with the desire of attaining and enjoying their birth and pledged rights and the absolute necessity of freedom and self-government for their material and moral development, progress and prosperity. No palliatives of any kind whatever can or will do any good at all. To be prosperous, India must govern itself. Good government could never be a substitute for government by the people themselves.

N. K. RAMASWAMI.

THE EPICS OF INDIA AND GREECE.*

The Ramayana and the Odyssey.

BY MR. THOMAS C. RICE, B. A.

III. NO details of a marriage ceremony are given us in the Odyssey. When Telemachus visited Menelaus at Sparta, arrangements were in preparation for despatching his daughter with rich gifts to Phthia to be the bride of Achilles' son. This marriage had been arranged by the father on diplomatic grounds during the siege of Troy. His natural son was also married at the same time. All that is stated is that a choir of girls escorted the bride to the nuptial chamber. In the great hall, a bard, who usually figured at every entertainment sang heroic lays and two youths performed a dance. Much freedom seems to have been allowed to the girls in the choice of their future husbands. The princess Nausicaa of Phæacia is not censured for thinking about her own marriage. The custom of choosing the most stalwart warrior for a husband appears in the narrative of the old bow of Ulysses being produced and the suitors being required to establish their claim by stringing the weapon. This same custom is mentioned both in the Mahabharata and the Ramayana; in the one case Draupadi and in the other Sita is bestowed on the ablest warrior judged by this test. The usage as to the disposal of widows among the Greeks is clearly indicated in the Odyssey. In the early times, in the Vedic and Heroic ages in India, the custom of the burning of widows with the corpses of their husbands was unknown. The wives of Drita-rashtra were not immolated, nor were those of Dasaratha. It is said that some of the wives of Ravana were burnt alive on the funeral pile of their husband ‡; and as, according to several authors, the poet has ascribed Aryan customs to the Rakshasas, there may be ground for the argument that *sati* was a very old institution. But since Mandodari, the first and favourite wife of Ravana, was exempted, it is to be concluded that those burnt were merely slave girls, and that the offering was a sacrifice like that of the twelve youths immolated by Achilles on the pyre of his friend Patroclus. Whatever might have been the custom

* We regret very much that, in the previous instalment of this article in page 201 of our last issue, an unfortunate error has crept in. Our readers are requested to omit lines from 6 to 30 in the said page and cnnect line 31 with line 5 as they form parts of one sentence. Ed. *M. Q. R.*

‡ Dowson's *Dict. of Hindu Myth.*; art. *Ravana.*

as to the sacrifice of widows there is no instance of their re-marriage among the Indian Aryans. It was different among the Greeks. Penelope had free choice to marry again if her husband had died. At least in the case of a king's relict, therefore, she was allowed to marry again if she was so inclined, and the sons of the neighbouring kings, and even the nobles of the land aspired to be her suitors. It was regarded as the duty of the son of the deceased monarch to send his widowed mother to her father, and her father had a right to demand that the dowry he gave with his daughter should be restored to him. If she married again the father should give a rich dowry with her to her second husband, but her son by her first husband was not liable to furnish the marriage portion. The nobles who came as suitors to the palace for the hand of the widow of the deceased monarch, feasted and revelled and made free with the cattle, sheep and pigs in the royal farms and the wine in the royal cellars. If a wife proved unfaithful the injured husband was fain to accept compensation for the wrong in the shape of a large fine, as in the amusing episode sung by the bard of the frailty of the goddess Aphrodite, how Poseidon came forward with the offer of a large mulct to the angry husband Mulciber, with which he seemed quite willing to be appeased. Mulciber also in this scene angrily insists that Zeus must "refund his shameless daughter's dower" ¶, showing that in this case the wife was purchased from the father.

In the Ramayana we have an interesting account of the marriage ceremonies when Sita was espoused to Rama. Whilst Rama stood on the eastern side of the altar Raja, Janaka brought his daughter into the presence of the sacred fire and placed her opposite to Rama. He said "This is my daughter Sita. Take her hand in yours and she will ever attend you like your shadow. Maintain her for life and be not offended if she ever commits a fault." Raja Janaka sprinkled the bridegrooms and their brides with water consecrated by the utterance of the holy mantras. Each bridegroom led his bride three times round the fire §. The bridegrooms after this ceremony led their brides into the inner apartments and each one seated his bride on his left side; the women tied their garments together, removed the brides' veils and desired the brides and bridegrooms to look each other in the face for the first time, and they exchanged garlands together.† The

¶ Pope's Trans. of the *Odyssey*.

§ Notice the small part taken by the Brahmans in this ceremony. It shows the antiquity of the ritual.

† We are indebted for this account to Wheeler's Hist. of Ind. Vol. II.

ceremony at this marriage was somewhat different from that observed at the nuptials of Draupadi, when she was led by her brother to Arjuna and threw a garland round his neck. We have to notice here the survival of the ancient fire worship of the Aryans. Instances occur frequently of the worship of trees by walking round them three times, and of that of rivers. Sita prayed fervently to the Ganges and the Jumna while crossing them.

We have no references to a king's installation in either of the two Greek epics, but in the Ramayana the ceremonies preparatory to anointing a king are very fully described. On the first occasion when the plans of the old king were thwarted by the intrigues of his favourite wife, an elephant was ready at the gate of Rama's palace adorned with pearls and streaked with sandal, to carry him to the place prepared for the ceremony. After his return from Lanka, before he ascended the throne, Rama and Sita had to fast during the previous day and to pass the night without sleep. It is said that Rama "requested permission" of all the Rishis, Brahmans, Rajas, counsellors and ambassadors and seated himself upon the throne "with his face towards the east." The asking of leave, it is to be presumed, was a mere form of courtesy. Water was then poured over heads of the king and queen. In the first installation the preparations for which were brought to such an abrupt and startling close, mention is made, as to the usual accessories on such occasions, of the golden throne, the white umbrella, jewelled *chamaras*, the sacred tiger's skin, bow and scimitar, the sacrificial fire, elephants, four-in-hand chariots, golden pots filled with Ganges water, eight chosen damsels, the white-humped bull with a golden rope, a shaggy lion, cows with gilded horns, besides the utensils and materials used by the Brahmans in sacrifice‡.

The funeral ceremonies of the Indians and Greeks present points of near resemblance. Among both nations the dead body was burnt on a funeral pile. We have already seen in the Iliad how the obsequies of Patroclus were celebrated. In the Odyssey a simple funeral of one Elpenor, a sailor, is mentioned. The body was burnt, a great mound erected over the place of cremation and an oar stuck at the top, to imply what the calling was of the dead man (Od: Bk. XI). The throwing of locks of hair on the dead, shorn from the heads of

‡ Wheeler's *Hist. of Ind*, Vol. II, 8.

The allusion to the cows with gilded horns carries us to the scene in the Odyssey in which Nestor offers a sacrifice of a young bullock to Athene. A goldsmith was called and directed to wind its horns with gold bands.

the mourners, is referred to in the scene (Il. XXIII) in which the funeral rites of Patroclus are mentioned.

> "On him were all heads shorn,
> Even till they covered him with curls" *

The obsequies of Dasaratha were conducted in an elaborate fashion. There was a procession from the city to the burning ground, accompanying the bier, composed of the sons and wives of the deceased Raja, of his horses, elephants, chariots and foot soldiers, of the councillors, the attendants and all those whose offices brought them in personal relation to the deceased. The procession was carefully arrayed in a certain order. There were (1) the bards and eulogists, (2) the royal widows (3) the royal servants bearing the litter (4) royal servants bearing the ensigns of royalty (5) chariots filled with gold and jewels which were scattered among the multitude. The chief mourners were the king's sons, without whose presence no rite could be performed. In the absence of the eldest son Rama, the two younger sons Bharata and Satrughna officiated. They went forward exclaiming "Oh Maharaja! where art thou gone?" Fragrant billets of wood were collected for the funeral pile; jars of ghee, oil and wine, chaplets of sweet smelling flowers, ointment, perfumes, incense and aloes. A purified beast was taken and slain and its carcase was thrown on the funeral pile. Bharata walked round the pile. Here we note that the custom of animal sacrifices at obsequies must have prevailed at one time among the Indians as it did among the Greeks. After the remains of the deceased had been consumed by fire the libation of water was poured. Having bathed in the stream, Bharata took water in the palms of his joined hands and poured it out in memory of his father.

IV. There is no system of *ethics* permeating the Odyssey. The poet's object apparently is only to amuse. He says in an off-hand way in reference to the crime and punishment of Egysthus that mankind wrongly blame Zeus and Fate for sufferings which they bring on themselves by their own folly and want of foresight. But he does not care to follow a theory to its logical results like the learned men of India, or to reconcile exceptions to his rule. In a practical way, Homer says that those who are unjust and cruel are cursed during their life with curses not loud but deep and after their death those who suffered wrong at their hands defame them far and wide, whereas the hand of the generous is praised through distant climes and their

* Chapman's *Homer*.

memory is transmitted to future ages.* The doctrine of Fate was believed in both by the Hindus and the Greeks, but their conception of Fate was different.† Among the Greeks, a man suffered for the fault of his ancestors. The guilt of ancestors lay as a curse on families for many generations. This was in accordance with a proverb current among the Hebrews "The fathers have eaten sour grapes and the children's teeth are set on edge"¶. Sometimes a Greek, for some trifling offence against one of the gods who had all the passions and weaknesses of human beings, was followed with ceaseless persecution for years. Amongst the Hindus the doctrine of Fate is bound up with that of the Transmigration of souls. We expiate in the present life the sins that our souls committed when they existed in this world in a previous generation, making their mansion in some other body. Thus of Sita it is said "Be sure the lady's fate repays some mighty vow of ancient days"‡ in the sense that her present happiness is the reward of austerities in a past life; and Rama says (Bk. II. 22). "Tis Fate that sends me to the wilderness; 'tis Fate alone that gives to other hands the royal sway... What man may contend with Fate, whose all-commanding power, our former deeds alone can bind?"§

The chief ethical principle inculcated in the Indian epics is the obligation to do one's duty; that being the purpose of one's existence in the world, and each of the four castes had its special office assigned to it. This principle being followed up to its logical conclusion, it was laid down as the duty of the Kshatryas to protect the rishis and Brahmans, to hunt wild beasts, and to make war and exterminate all unbelievers and evil-doers, that is, those who passively or actively resisted the religious domination and the ceremonial forms introduced by the Brahman ascetics. In the interesting scene in which Sita asks Rama why he was preparing to make war on the Rakshasas who had done them no harm, the main issue is evaded. Sita says "You have come

* The Greek poet taught that the gods honoured justice and righteousness and punished the wicked. He attempted according to his lights to solve the eternal problem of the prosperity of the wicked and the misfortunes of the righteous. He believed that pirates and conquerors were sent as avengers by Zeus to punish offending men; as scourges of God, as Tamerlane boasted to be. The poet also does not omit to mention that the wicked are not entirely happy; their consciences never fail to accuse them. These are the commonplaces of ethics that we have inherited from the remotest times.

† See Note from Gorresis in the Appendix to Griffith's Trans. of the *Ramayana*, Bk. II.

¶ Ezekiel XVIII. 2.

‡ Griffith's Ram: Bk. II.

§ Id.

into the forest as a devotee, but now you have engaged to compass the death of the Rakshasas". Rama replies that he has made a promise to the Brahmans and Rishis, and ought not to break it; but if that promise was contrary to some other moral law, it should not have been made. The righteousness of the war with the Rakshasas could not fail to give rise to a question of ethics among a nation like the Indo-Aryans who subjected the most trifling actions of their lives to self-examination with reference to a moral code. What real grounds for war they might have had it is now impossible to discover, but that civilisation should advance at the expense of the uncivilised is a relentless law of evolution of which we have examples everywhere. That the Aryan civilisation of northern India did not altogether supplant that of the south may be due either to the mildness of the methods employed for its dissemination or to the fact that a civilisation almost as high, but of different origin, prevailed in the Dekkan.

Another act of questionable justice was the slaughter of Bali, the chief of Kishkindya, and the installation of Sugriva his younger brother in his place. That the change favoured Rama's plans is evident, for he now had an ally whose services he intended to make use of. Bali was the elder brother and natural heir to the throne. Divested of poetical colouring the truth seems to have been that Sugriva had been guilty of an act of base treachery against his brother. Bali had gone to hunt a wild beast in its den, and Sugriva blocked up the mouth of the cave evidently intending to starve his brother inside; then gave out that he saw blood oozing out of the mouth of the cave, and sat on the throne which every one now assumed to be vacant. It was somewhat like the story of the English king John and his brother Richard, the Lion-hearted. Bali, bursting out of his cave, appeared at his palace full of rage and drove his brother into exile, whose wife he appropriated as the forfeit of treachery and his lawful prize. Rama shot Bali to death with an arrow and enthroned Sugriva. In discussing the righteousness of Rama's conduct, the issue is again confused by the Sanskrit bard. Rama acquits himself of blame by saying that Bali was guilty of adultery which was a very grievous sin. It might have been so among the Brahmans and Kshatryas but not among the non-Aryan tribes of south India, among some of whom it was common for a wife to belong to all the brothers in the family.¶

¶ Bali was given the poor consolation that if he fought bravely as a warrior and fell by the hand of Rama, who was a manifestation of the deity, he would go straight to heaven.

It is a curious circumstance that among the Indian Aryans suicide was not regarded as in any way a sinful act. Against this we may place in contrast the European idea put into excellent language by Shakespeare. Hamlet says " O that the Everlasting had not fixed his canon 'gainst self-slaughter".

"Against self-slaughter
There is a prohibition so divine
That cravens my weak hand"*

In the Ramayana, any small perversity of circumstances, any little ruffling of the even tenor of one's life, inclines one to commit suicide. Thus Kaikeyi, Sita, Bharata and many others threaten to do away with themselves by fire, by water, by the halter, or by poison. Death by fire or water was not dreaded, because Agni and Varuna were regarded as the gods of these elements, and dissolution by fire or the embrace of the water were looked upon as taking the soul direct into the bosoms of these deities; but that death by poison should be mentioned is singular, as by the laws of Manu the selling of poison was one of the trades classed as dishonorable. There are scenes also in which rishis, in the full possession of all their faculties, have deliberately collected a pile of wood, set it on fire and entered the flames.

The paramount obligation of keeping a promise, of not uttering a falsehood and of obedience to the commands of parents is inculcated in the conduct of Dasaratha and Rama on which the whole sequel of the story depends, and the poet indirectly points to the evils of the Kshatriya kings marrying an unlimited number of wives. There are two actions mentioned of formidable power in their results, the efficacy of the rishi's curse, and the potency of ascetic penances. The former was most dreadful and all classes trembled to incur it; by the latter Ravana obtained the gift of being invincible even by the gods and the Kshatrya Vishwamitra rose to the rank of a Brahman; but the poet admits the possibility of this last with extreme reluctance, pointing out the insuperable difficulties in the way and signifying that the honour is altogether out of the reach of men born in the other classes. The treatment of women was mild. The mischievous hunch-backed maid of Kaikeyi was beaten and illtreated, but was not allowed to be put to death. In contrast with this we may mention the horrible cruelty practised on the maids of Ulysses' palace who were found dishonoring the mansion by their love intrigues. But Euryclea, the favourite maid of Penelope and Ulysses, was treated with extreme

* *Cymbeline* III 4.

kindness. We may assume on good grounds that both among the Greeks and the Indians, servants belonging to the same race as their masters were kindly treated, but those of the inferior races who had been purchased or enslaved were harshly dealt with.

We may mention here the atheistical arguments of the sage Javali and Rama's answer to them. These arguments admit of refutation on other grounds, but Rama merely cites authorities, and his arguments would not convince one who denied the sacredness or the authenticity of the records.

V. Of true *history* there is very little trace in the Odyssey. There was a tradition among the Phæacians of Scheria that they had been driven from their original homes by a less civilised but more manly race whom they called the Cyclopes. Here we have a conflict between two races, as in India between the Aryans and the Rakshasas. The same epithets of scorn are applied, and the same exaggerated pictures of deformity are drawn in each case of the enemies whom they could not tolerate; but while in Europe the physically hard, but mentally degenerate race overcame by superior force their opponents with opposite qualities, in India it was the force of a superior civilisation which swept away before it the elements of barbarism.

The course of the Aryan invasion of south India is marked by the names of the settlements of Rama in the wilderness. Allahabad, Nasik, Rishya-mukha, Pampa, Kishkindya, the Neilagherries, marked his course. Some of the names are hard to identify. The sage Agastya had been a pioneer before Rama. Stripping off the mass of legend and fable that covers in many layers the core of historical fact that lies beneath, we get some insight into the way in which the Aryan influence percolated through the dense mass of non-Aryan beliefs and customs, that pervaded the races of the Dekkan, while itself taking some tinge from the alien culture with which it came in contact. We beg our readers to understand that we do not wish to dogmatise on the the subject, but only offer what is at any rate a possible interpretation. When the language of the poet clearly shows in some places that his meaning is allegorical, we may reasonably assume that, in other places where the allegorical meaning is not so evident, but where similar images are employed, an allegory is concealed, and may profitably engage in the search after it.

The Aryan invasion then, of Southern India, did not take the form of armed expeditions with a view to conquest, but was achieved in a peaceable way. The Rishis and their disciples, abandoning the

towns, retired into the forests and there built hermitages in suitable situations. The forests were not crowded with people, so that they did not entrench on the lands or property of other owners. These little lonely settlements were established far apart, and small colonies of Brahman youths in the student stage of their lives with their preceptors, divided off from the parent settlements and founded others. In this way the settlements of the Rishis extended to a great distance southwards, studding the country as far as the river Kistna, during what we may call the heroic age. They came in contact with various tribes of the South, some intelligent and tractable, others savage and stubborn. In the northern regions of the Central Provinces these tribes were thinly scattered and offered but a feeble opposition, but as the settlements extended southwards they began to be established in the heart of a numerous aboriginal population. The Dravidian kingdoms of the South had attained a high degree of civilisation and opulence by trade with the Persian Gulf and the Red Sea, and though their civilisation was of a different type from the Aryan, they were quite able to hold their own against the invaders. The establishment of these colonies of Rishis amongst them, though harmless, appears to have been disagreeable to people of quite another way of thinking. They began to molest the Rishis by sprinkling blood upon the peaceful, bloodless offerings of flowers, clarified butter and the like, which the devotees used to offer up to the gods upon altars raised of clay and covered with turf. They sometimes overthrew the altars themselves and committed similar ravages more of an annoying than dangerous character. Among the disciples of the Rishis, besides peaceful Brahman youths, were young princes of the Kshatrya race who were not disposed to put up with these annoyances calmly. When we read of Rakshasas, Danavas Daityas and Asuras, we are to expel from our minds the ideas connoted by these terms in Sanskrit, as giants, demons and enemies of the gods, and to understand by them mere race designations, like *Nishadas* and *Vanars.* In this sense we shall employ them. The Nishadas have been identified with the Bhils. The Vanars were a totemistic tribe, in their own tradition tracing descent from a monkey ancestor and paying religious veneration to that animal. The "Bears" were a neighbouring tribe who claimed a similar relationship to a bear ancestor. So were also the "Vultures".‡ These were some of the tribes by whom Southern India was then peopled. But among the most important and

‡ The Hindu bards flattered these tribes by tracing their origin to Aryan deities.

advanced of the races of the Dekkan were the Rakshasas.† They had reached a high degree of civilisation by commerce and intercourse with the nations of the Red Sea and the Persian Gulf. They were familiar with the sea. Their sovereignty extended over Southern India and the Island of Ceylon in which their capital was situated. The captial is described as a gorgeous place by the poet who certainly did not like them. This extensive empire was ruled in Rama's time by the great monarch Ravana who fixed his captial at Lanka, the name of the island as well as the city. He had two of his brothers owning vassalage to him and ruling over provinces south of the Narbada; he had also viceroys under him. His brothers tried to conciliate the invading Aryans by bringing about a marriage alliance between their sister Surpa-nakha‡ and either of the Aryan brethren Rama or Lakshmana, but the pride of birth and race which acts with exceptional force in India led the brothers to reject the offered alliance with concealed sarcasm. Matters continued strained till events of which we have no certain knowledge at this distance of time, led to an open breach. Rama and his brother had no large Aryan following, but policy was of as much service as arms. They entered into alliances with the refractory tribes, compulsorily subject to Rakshasa domination, called in the poem, the "Monkeys", the "Bears" and the "Vultures". A disputed succession between two "Monkey" brothers, Bali and Sugriva, the former a protege of Ravana, for the chieftainship of Kishkhindya gave Rama an opportunity of interfering. He slew the reigning Monkey sovereign Bali, and placed his younger brother Sugriva on the throne. He thus cemented an alliance with the powerful "Monkey" tribe. He got also the alliance of other dissatisfied tribes under the Rakshasas, viz., the Bears and the Vultures. Ravana heard that Rama Sita and Lakshmana with their troops had taken up their winter quarters in a strong fortress out of which he desired to draw them. He despatched a wagon load of treasure consisting of gold and gems directing that it should be taken past the neighbourhood of the fort and ordering his general Maricha to go as an escort with a body of troops. Meantime he contrived to let it be known to Rama that this

† Perhaps from the Aryan root *rak*, to roar, to bellow.

It has been argued that by these mischievous sacrifice-spoilers the poet meant the Buddhists. (See Wheeler, Hist. of Ind. Vol. II). But Buddhists according to the vital principles of their religion were taught not to be aggressive but forbearing, whereas these Rakshasas wantonly molested the Rishis. The Buddhists thought it sinful to shed the blood of any creature, but the Rakshasas defiled the sacrifices with blood and bones.

‡ Surpa-nakha = "having nails like winnowing-fans." Dowson's Class. Dict.

treasure was on its way, Rama immediately proceeded to intercept the treasure, leaving Lakshmana in charge of his wife, in the fort. The secret agents of Ravana spread the report to Sita that Rama and his detachment had been cut off and that Rama was either slain or in desperate straits. Sita instantly commanded Lakshmana to go to help of her husband, against his better judgment, taunting him with unfaithfulness to his brother and a design against herself, when he objected to going on the ground that she would be left unguarded. Ravana then made a dash for the fort, seizing Sita as a valuable prize and security for Rama's future conduct. Some time elapsed before Rama was in a position to muster sufficient strength to make an attack on Ravana's stronghold of Lanka. Here also he made use of policy and strategy to make up for the inferiority of his forces in number and quality. In this respect he bore a great resemblance to the hero with whom we are comparing him, Ulysses. He opened communications with the disaffected subjects of Ravana, and especially with Ravana's brother Vibhishana who was ambitious of gaining the throne for himself, and readily deserted to the side of Rama. With this substantial help from the enemies in Ravana's own household, Rama succeeded in taking Lanka and slaying Ravana and enthroning his brother in his stead; although his troops consisted only of levies, raised among the wild aboriginal tribes inhabiting the forests of Southern India.

VI. The kings of ancient India as well as of Greece were absolute. Their authority was patriarchal. In Greece, the chief nobles were invited to council by the king, but their counsel was only advisory. If Ithaca may be taken as a type of the small monarchies in Greece and the outlying islands during the Heroic age, we have a few glimpses of the constitution of these states. There was no general assembly of the people to advise the king, but the nobles met on critical occasions as when the state was in danger from foreign invasion. During the absence of Ulysses no regency was appointed; but his son's claim to succeed was tacitly admitted, though not openly acknowledged. Telemachus assumes the regal state, sits on the throne of his father and wields his father's sceptre in the assembly he convokes, (Bk. I.) but his right to summon the peers is not acknowledged as a matter of course. One of the nobles Aegyptius inquires by whose commands the council was called. Had Ulysses perished on his return from Troy, the right of his son to succeed him would not have been acknowledged as a settled custom. From the remarks of Telemachus himself and of some of the nobles at the assembly it would appear that Zeus himself

chose the king, but how the divine will was made known is not apparent. Telemachus is assured that even should he not succeed to the royal power, the private estates of his father would descend to him by hereditary right and that the nobles would unite to secure for him his paternal estates. Here a distinction is made between the private estates of the king and his right to the public property. Telemachus had to apply to the nobles for the loan of a barge to carry him to Pylos. When he arrived at Nestor's city, the aged king asked him if his subjects had rebelled "in obedience to an oracle." In the Grecian states sometimes, when public calamity, plague or famine overtook the state the oracles attributed it to the secret crimes of the king or of one of his ancestors, as in the story of Oedipus. The king might abdicate in favour of his son, as Laertes did in favour of Ulysses. The land he turned into a garden was afterwards purchased by him out of his own earnings.

In India owing to the marriage of the king to many wives, the order of succession was a matter of grave anxiety not only to the king, but to the nobles and the whole nation. To put an end to uncertainty the king's successor was anointed during his life time and the choice as a rule fell on the eldest born of the king's sons; but the king was at liberty to change the order of succession, and if he did so, his will was acquiesced in with reverent obedience by the whole body of his subjects though they murmured among themselves and made not very complimentary remarks on the doting folly of the king who allowed the intrigues of his favourite wife to influence him in matters of state policy. The king's power in India was despotic, but it was a benevolent despotism. The king was bound by a moral code whose maxims he dared not question and which was laid down in writing by the Rishis and had already been so long in force as to acquire the sanctity of hoary age and long established custom. His minutest duties were prescribed in the clearest terms. The account of how Rama spent a day generally after he became king is interesting. He performed his morning devotions, then sat upon his throne in the council hall and administered the affairs of the raj. In the noon he took his meal in the apartments of his mother and in her presence. In the evening he went to his garden house, sent for Sita, sat upon the same couch with his wife, and maidens of the palace sang and danced before them. §

§ In the drama of *Sakuntala* the king Dushmanta complains of the terribly heavy duties imposed on him by his position, and the exhaustion he felt under them. His clown tells him that the king is like a large tree which bears the full force of the sun's heat and shelters those under its shade.

In order to consult on the appointment of Yuvaraja the Maharaja Dasaratha summoned not only the nobles but the commons and people of his realm. At this council were present his ministers and councillors, all the chieftains of the raj, all the officers of the army and all the people of the city of Ayodhya and the country of Kosala. In the magic palace created by Bharadwaja, after the councillors and priests had seated themselves, last of all the general of the army took his seat with a reverential bow. The significance of the last fact is to be noted. The general was either a man of low class or a foreigner. In Ithaca, when the young nobles conspired to waylay and kill the prince Telemachus, the queen gave orders to convene the tribes. It was apparently the custom in times of danger to collect together all the people assembled in tribes. From these facts it is evident that both in Ancient India and in Greece it was the practice on all important occasions for the kings to discuss public affairs with the people. The rights of heralds and agents sent from hostile kings were recognised in India. Suka, Ravana's envoy said to Rama, "Heralds never must be slain; to him alone death is due, who leaves his master's speech unsaid, and speaks another in its stead."* When Hanuman was seized at Lanka, Ravana ordered him to be put to death but his brother Vibhishana said to him: "It has been laid down in the Shastras that an envoy is never to be put to death; he may be disfigured or beaten with leathern stripes, or his head may be shaved; for these are the three punishments proper to an envoy." Among the Greeks, a homicide fleeing from the vengeance of the relatives of his victim was given an asylum in a neighbouring state, apparently without any question being asked whether there were just grounds for the bloodshed. Thus, when Telemachus was leaving the shores of Pylos on his return to Ithaca, one Theoclymenus came running to him, saying he had killed a man, and that the deceased's relatives were in pursuit of him. The prince, without any demur, took him into his ship and afforded him shelter and a guest's welcome in Ithaca.

(To be continued).

THOMAS C. RICE.

---

* Griffith's *Ramayana* VI, 20.

CASTE SPIRIT IN THE ANGLICAN CHURCH.

By Mr. C. I. Varughise.

WHEN the events that have recently taken place at Kottayam among the members of the Anglican Church, in consequence of an objection raised by a certain few of them against seating three students of the Cambridge Nicholson Institution who are of Pulaya origin along with the other students in the church at Divine Service, have brought to the front this subject of supreme importance to the Christian Church in India, it is but timely and interesting that an attempt should be made to give a full and intelligent history of the extension and the operation, in the Indian Church, of caste which hostile in its very essence to the spirit of the Gospel, is as a fretting leprosy in the body, corrupting its very life-blood, and producing in the long-run wounds and bruises and putrifying sores. We are indebted for the following facts, to an article which was published in the *Church Missionary Intelligence* in 1882 under the title of '*Caste in Mission Churches.*'

India has been in a sense the birthplace and cradle of Eastern faiths. In India caste orginated a system so deeply embedded in the corruptions of Man's Nature that it would live on through all the mutations of ages, the crash of empires and the rise and fall of dynasties. Thoughtful thousands have lost all faith in caste itself; but they are still the victims of its tyranny as truly as those who pay to it the homage of faith. Caste, like some dread wiry creeper, spreads itself throughout all the ramifications of society; nothing escapes its grasp; one may fancy one has found a spot free from its influence, but experience soon shows that even there the rigid tendrils have penetrated. Five centuries before the birth of Christ, Brahmanical arrogance and tyranny had reached that point which could hardly be surpassed, and the degradation and oppression of the inferior castes had well nigh passed the bounds of endurance. Then it was that Gautama issued from his solitary retreat, and went everywhere proclaiming the absolute oneness of man and pouring contempt on the whole system of caste. The glad tidings fell on the ears of crushed millions, and they rallied around his standard. Brahmanism was hurled into the dust; for long centuries it seemed as though caste was vanquished and banished. It was far otherwise. It was but biding its time. That time came, and Buddhism in its turn was swept from the land of its

birth. One of the most striking illustrations of the potency and perpetuity of caste is the fact that even Buddhism caught the infection. In India, the only remnant of early Buddhism is a body of Jains; and these have succumbed to the influence of caste.

The Christian Church in India is not a bright and glorious oasis free from the surrounding miasma. Of the many thousands of Native Christians, multitudes are of a high order; and tried by any tests which one would apply to ordinary Christianity at home, the Church in India would hold its own with credit. But it must be confessed with humiliation and sorrow that the deadly evil of caste nestles within its bosom. The evil first came into prominence in the Missions of Southern India. Northern and Western India too have, though in a less degree, to lament its prevalence. The evil is not confined to the Missions of this or that society. It pervades the congregations of all societies. The first Protestant Mission in India was commenced in 1075 at Tranquebar under the auspices of the Danish Government. The earliest Missionaries seem from the first to have taken a firm stand on the question of caste. They grasped its essential character and determined to give it no place within their Church. The question which has puzzled so many as to a social element in caste does not seem to have once occurred to them. To their minds, caste and social distinctions were two totally different things; to caste, no mercy must be shown; but they were no levellers; social distinctions they approved and upheld.

Some persons have a sort of misty notion that caste is only another name for social distinctions. In truth, the difference between the two things is as wide as the poles. Though the two may have superficial features of resemblance, they are in their nature and essence, totally diverse. Caste declares that Brahma the creator formed from different parts of his own person four distinct races; these are generically as distinct from one another as are the different races of animals on the earth. From this fundamental conception necessarily ensues the immutability of Caste. No Sudra can by any possibility become a Brahman; he and his children to all generations must remain Sudras and be nothing else. The same principle applies to all other castes. Now this one feature removes caste out of all comparison with social distinctions. These are marked by constant mutation. In every civilized community social rank and position fluctuate. A beggar's son may become a lord; a lord's son may become a beggar. In this respect, personal merit or demerit plays its part in elevating or lowering men in that scale. All

this is foreign to caste; no amount of energy, merit or ability can raise a man in the caste scale by even a hair's breadth. A low caste man may rise socially; he may become a leader of society; he may, by his learning or skill or wealth, command the admiration of his fellows; but the stigma of his degraded caste cleaves to him like leprosy even until death, and so must it be with his children and his children's children for ever and ever.

Now the vigilance shown by the early missionaries in regard to caste was relaxed by their successors. The effect was speedy and deplorable. In 1726 separate schoolrooms were set up for Sudra and Pariah children, these had hitherto been taught together; a few years of caste indulgence had led the Christian Sudra to object to their children meeting in the same room with Pariah children. In such a matter, of course, concession means defeat and declension. A year later, the missionaries had to concede another point. The sittings in the churches had to be mapped out according to caste varieties. Three years later at a funeral, a Pariah catechist attended to read the Burial Service, the high caste relatives of the deceased declared that pollution would result from his ministrations, and to avoid that peril, they burnt the body. This brought another concession; henceforth it was ruled that Sudra catechists should minister to Sudras, Pariah catechists to Pariahs. In 1750, Schwartz appeared on the scene. By that time the deadly *virus* had penetrated the life-blood of the Church. He lamented the evil, hardly realized the intense gravity. He hoped that forbearance and moral suasion would set things right. He carefully avoided all coercive measures. Under such gentle treatment caste still lived on; it did not die a natural death. Schwartz's successors seem to have withdrawn even the semblance of opposition to caste. They had grown familiar with the thing and oblivious to its repulsive characteristics, and were prepared to accept it as a recognized institution. Caste, after a struggle of a hundred years, gained a complete victory. But bitter were the fruits of its triumph. Many Sudra Christians refused to enter a church in which their Pariah brother sat. Others made a compromise. They would sit on opposite sides of the church, provided the matting on which the respective castes sat was completely severed up the middle. In taking the Lord's Supper, the Sudra Christians must receive first, and the other castes after them. In some churches, two cups were used, the Sudras using the one, and the missionaries and Pariahs the other.

Such was the state of things when Bishop Heber appeared on the

scene. During a visitation of South India, the missionaries brought the question of caste to the notice of the Bishop. His Lordship inquired of several persons, and the representations of those who persisted in mixing up caste with social distinctions prevailed. Bishop Heber was succeeded by Bishop Wilson. He fully realized the gravity and solemnity of the subject in which he had to pronounce his decision. He was prompt; but not precipitate. He gathered information from every available source. On the 5th July 1833, his decision went forth in the form of a letter to the missionaries and their people. The tone of the despatch was tender and affectionate, but firm and unwavering. "The distinctions of caste", the Bishop wrote, "must be abandoned decidedly, immediately, finally. The gospel recognises no distinctions such as those of caste, imposed by heathen usage, bearing in some respects a religious obligation, and condemning those in the lower ranks to prepetual abasement, placing an immovable barrier against all general advance and improvement in society, cutting asunder the bonds of human fellowship on the one hand, and preventing those of christian love on the other. Such distinctions, I say, the Gospel does not recognise. The civil distinctions of rank among Christians form no hindrance to the intercourse and offices of charity; there is no impassable barrier; the first noble in the land will enter the abode and minister to the wants of the poorest cottager. There is nothing to hinder any one, from rising, by industry and good conduct to the loftiest elevations of society; the shades and gradations of rank are shifting prepetually; birth condemns no class of men, from generation to generation, to inevitable contempt, debasement and servitude. The grace of Christ, charity, the Church, the public worship of God, the Holy Communion unite all as in one common fold, under one common shepherd." Henceforth the Bishop ruled that all overt manifestations of caste must be banished from the churches; the people must sit together without distinction as christian brethren; all separate approach to the holy table must be given up; the people must accept the services of, and admit to their houses, native priest or catechist, whatever his caste might be; in all church meetings the Christians of every class must have free access; in the burial-grounds no separate portion should be allotted to the so-called high caste christians. As regards mission agents, in the case of their refusing to act on these instructions, a period should be given them for reflection. Should they still refuse compliance, their names must be struck off the list of agents;

but if after that, they repented and sought restoration, they should, if possible, be restored.

Now it was one thing to wish caste dead, and another thing to close with it in deadly conflict. The Missionaries hesitated. They communicated with the Bishop, and sought further instruction on other features of the case. In January 1834, the Bishop replied at length. He continued in the same mind as when he first wrote, that caste must be renounced decidedly, promptly, finally. The Bishop's decision was communicated to the people. Several of the smaller congregations, after a slight demur, gave in their adhesion. But in the larger stations of Trichinopoly, Vepery and Tanjore, the anticipated opposition was fully realized. At the former place the reading of the Bishop's letter was followed by the withdrawal of almost the whole body of the Sudra Christians; they refused to attend divine worship and would hold no intercourse with their Missionary. At Vepery, an immense congregation assembled to hear the reading of the letter. The Missionary only advanced two or three pages when the main body of Sudras, men, women and children rose in silence and left the church. Several connected with the mission still kept their seats; at length a message from without came to them, and they with one exception left the church. The Missionary was thus left alone with one catechist; but he too refused to conform. Weeks passed on, the seceders did not return; and thus the services were carried on with none but the Pariah Christians. At Tanjore the effect was the same. The aged Missionary, Kohlhoff, at the close of his sermon read the Bishop's letter. The moment he finished, all the Sudra men arose and one attempted to speak. Another Missionary begged him not to disturb the service, and observed that on the morrow they might all state their case. A scene of painful confusion ensued. The Venerable Missionary descended the pulpit, and together with his wife and colleague left the church followed by the groans and hisses of the turbulent Sudras. Two months were given to the recalcitrant mission agents to reconsider their decision. Of the four priests only one conformed, and of the general body of agents almost all refused to submit. One noteworthy feature of that trying time was the fact that several Europeans high in station encouraged the factious Christians in their un-christian obstinacy. The matter was even brought to the notice of government and was commented on in anything but a favourable light by the Governor-General of the day. Reference was then made to the Court of Directors, and happily, for itself as well as the church, that august body decided that the question was one of a

purely ecclesiastical character and outside its sphere of observations.

After a lapse of some months, the Bishop landed at Madras. In the meantime the seceders had held their ground; they refused to enter the churches, but in some cases they conducted separate services among themselves. A few separate schools were also set up. The Bishop preached twice in the Mission Church at Vepery. On these occasions the Sudras, were present, but they sat or stood apart as in former days and all retired before the administration of Holy Communion. He deferred any further action until he should visit Tanjore and Trichinopoly. On arriving at the former place he found things about as discouraging as could be conceived. Bitterness and wrath marked the dissentients, and their moral standard was deplorable. The Missionaries were reviled and hated. The Bishop had interviews with the nonconformists. The suspended clergy, catechists and the people with one voice implored the Bishop to relax the terms of his decision. Several admitted that there was no doubt the Bible and Christianity were on the Bishop's side but the rule was too strict for India. For the high castes to sit with the low castes, and in common with them partake of the elements in the Lord's Supper, would involve the former in serious difficulties; they would be called Pariahs; their heathen neighbours would despise them and their daughters could never be married. A schoolmaster contended that the doctrine of the Trinity showed that there was somewhat of caste distinction in heaven, then why not on earth. The whole body then departed, exclaiming that they would not attend church. With a saddened heart, but unshaken purpose, the Bishop went on to Trichinopoly. For nine months past the Sudras had absented themselves from church, but the appearance of the Bishop either softened their prejudice or awakened their curiosity. The recalcitrants flocked to their old sanctuary. When the Bishop in his robes advanced up the crowded aisle he saw Sudras and Pariahs stand in separate parties A thought flashed upon him, which he at once acted upon. He caught hold of a Sudra by one hand and a Pariah by the other, and brought them up before the communion rails, and there seated them side by side. His chaplain and other clergy copied the Bishop's example. The whole thing was such a surprise that no one found time to object. At the administration of the Lord's Supper, the Bishop gave a few directions, the effect of which was seen when the clergy and several European residents brought up and placed promiscuously at the holy table those who had been sitting together. The ice was then broken, and a nucleus was formed which steadily grew. Thankful and hopeful the Bishop returned

to Tanjore. He was still more cheered on reaching that spot to receive a letter from the Vepery Christians in which they confessed their past error and promised for the future implicit obedience to the Bishop's directions. The service at Tanjore completed his joy. The church was crowded by all castes, and though some sat apart, others were commingled. The experiment at Trichinopoly was not repeated. Everybody approached the holy table as he liked, and a large number communicated including some Sudras. Bishop Wilson, by his strength of will and force of character, came out the hero of the mortal conflict in which he was engaged with the hydra-headed monster-caste.

C. I. VARUGHISE.

THE INFLUENCE OF MUHAMADAN RULE ON INDIA—II.

By Mr. A. Krishna Aiyar, B. A.

We shall next see, how far Hinduism was affected by the presence of Islam in India. It is a well-known fact that the Mussalmans, with their usual zeal, had, from the very beginning, been active in spreading their religion, by every means in their power, force not excluded. The prospect of recognition at the hands of the rulers, and of rise in the economic and social position, acted, as they always do, strongly on the minds of all, especially of the lower orders of society; while in many remarkable instances, especially at the commencement, force acted with tremendous effect. The net result, after these several centuries, is the Islamic India of our day.

The close contact of Hinduism with Islam, for the last so many centuries, could not but have exerted some mutual influence upon both. But we must not conclude from this that Hinduism was influenced by Islam to the same extent, as it was, say, by Budhism. "To neither of these, Islam or Christianity, do we feel inclined to ascribe any influence of any significance on Hindu *Theology*; which appears to us sufficiently accounted for, by reference to its own resources."* In the matter of theological doctrines or worship, it does not indeed seem to have influenced our religion to any appreciable extent. The reason is obvious. Hinduism, in its comprehensive form, does not hold forth any particular doctrine or doctrines for its votaries to swallow on pain of excommunication, but contains all doctrines and all manner of worship, suitable to all people of all shades of opinion and of different stages of growth. "From the high spiritual flights of Vedantic philosophy, of which the latest discoveries of science seem like echoes, from the Agnosticism of the Budhists, and the Atheism of the Jains, to the low ideas of idolatry and the multifarious mythologies, each and all have a place in the Hindus' religion."‡ Thus "Hinduism has never produced an exclusive dominant orthodox sect, with a formula of faith to be professed or rejected under pain of damnation."†

We must therefore look elsewhere for the influence of Islam on the religious feeling of India. From the beginning of the fourteenth

---

* Barth's "Religions of India", pp. 211-212.

‡ Swami Vivekananda in his lecture at the Parliament of Religions.

† Vincent Smith's "Asoka" p. 39.

century to about the end of the fifteenth century, there was a great religious revival throughout India. Earlier yet, about the twelfth, there was a great religious revival in South India led by Ramanuja. Over this, Islam cannot be said to have had any influence whatever; because it had hardly made its appearance then in India. But in the Hindu religious movements of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries and after, its influence is easily traceable. It was during this period that a host of Bhagavats and religious teachers flourished—Ramananda (C. 1300-1400); Kabir (C. 1380-1420), Nanak Shah (C. 1469), Krishna Chaitanya (C. 1486-1527) and Dadu (C. 1544). Most of these Bhagavats, while preaching their several doctrines, laid, it will be observed, special emphasis on the brotherhood of all men, and their religions, the right of every man to worship the same Iswara and the glories of Bhakthi or faith as being within the reach of all. Even before the advent of Islam this Bhakthimarga movement had been showing itself potent here and there; the characteristics of which were *that this was mainly led by Non-Aryan leaders*; and the *movement was accompanied by an enrichment of the Vernacular languages and literature*. Also, it *admitted the claims of all people to worship the same God*, and aimed at lessening distinctions in social rank. But in the hands of its best known exponents like Kabir and Nanak, one easily sees the effects of Islam and Hinduism mixed. It is not that Hinduism lacked the fundamental points of these teachers; but the exclusive nature of caste distinctions and the quarells about external forms and ceremonies must have shrouded in obscurity those fundamental religious truths which are found emphasised in the Upanishads and Ithihasas and the Budhist Scriptures; so that, Islam, if it did not originate these movements, gave, no doubt, a quickening impulse to the dormant spirit of Hinduism. "It is possible that indirectly the presence of Islam might have contributed in some measure towards the budding and bursting forth of the great religious reforms, which in the absence of doctrines altogether new, introduced into Hinduism, a new organization and a new spirit." ¶

For since Islam was itself, in essence based upon the Bhakthi Marga, and since the recent Hindu revival was also a Bhakthi Marga movement, a closer fusion of the two religions became possible. The best products of this fusion, and two of the most catholic of Indian Bhagavat sects are, in our own days, the Kabir Panthis and the Sikhs. The first of these sects was founded by Kabir, a weaver by birth, a

¶ Barth's "Religions of India" pp. 211-212

disciple of Ramananda, the great reformer of Benares and he made man's equality before God, the basis of his teaching. He was much occupied with the study of Islam and his one great object was to found a religion, that would be acceptable to Hindus and Mussalmans alike, though he himself was an ardent worshipper of Sri Rama. The sacred book of his followers says "To Ali and to Rama, we owe our life and we should show tenderness to all alike. The city of the Mussalman God is in the West (Mecca) and the city of the Hindu God is in the East (Benares). Explore your heart, and there you will find both the God of the Hindus and the Mussalmans. He to whom the world belongs is the Father of the worshippers alike of Rama and Ali". In this way he made a compromise between the two religions. Consequently in Northern India, Kabir is claimed by the Hindus as a Hindu, and throughout Bengal, Guzerat and portions of the Dakhan, it is said, that the Mussalmans claim him as one of themselves. He is said to have found fault with some of the objectionable practices of the Hindus, as much as, he assailed the fanaticism and intolerance of Islam. In the beginning of the sixteenth century, the reforms of Ramananda, were introduced into Bengal by Sri Krishna Chaitanya. He is said to have reconverted some Muhammadans and admitted all classes as members of his sect. About the same time, Vallabhaswamy, a Brahman of Telingana, extended this reformation to Guzerat. Thus in the beginning of the sixteenth century, the Hindu mind was no longer stagnant or retrogressive; it had been leavened with Muhammadanism and changed and quickened for a new development" ‡ It is needless for our present purpose to describe or enumerate the differences between the various sects; but enough has been said to point out the directions in which Muhammadan influence was felt during this revival.

The same effect, if not more, can be found in the new sect that was forming during this period-the Sikhs. Nanak Shah, the founder of this sect, a Hindu by birth, with some ideas essentially Hindu, gained a fair knowledge of the practices of both the Koran and the Hindu Sastras, in his youth. Himself an ardent enquirer after truth, he rejected both the Koran and the Sastras; and unable for some time to find the true God anywhere, he travelled even beyond the frontiers of his country into Mussalman Kingdoms, at last returned home, and became a religious teacher, calling upon men to worship the invisible God, to live a righteous life, and to be tolerant of the failings of others. His whole teaching can be put in a nutshell, in these memorable words

‡ Cunningham's 'History of the Sikhs' Chap. 2, p. 40.

of his, "*There is no Hindu, no Mussalman*". In all his songs there is but little of aggressive superiority and both Hindus and Mussalmans found his teachings sweet and reasonable. Though he repudiated the caste system, he recognised it as a civil institution. "Though the Adi-Granth of the Sikhs" says Barth "from first to last breathes the mystic pantheism of the Vedanta, and the doctrines of Grace and absolute devotion to the Guru, yet it is difficult to eliminate from it that which is due to Mussalman influence."§ This influence must have been all the greater, since the land of the Sikhs is on the N. W. corner of India, the border of Mussalman countries. "It is from the followers of the Arabian prophet that they especially borrowed the military fanaticism and the dignity of a holy war, a notion which in no respect is a Hiudu one, and which under the same influence developed among the Mahrattas and certain Rajput tribes......"†

Summing up the whole a great writer says. "Although they (the Mussalmans) imposed upon India, a foreign yoke, they brought about a reform in Hinduism, by affording to the Hindus, the spectacle of a nation, whose guiding principle is the belief in the unity of God—while the toleration of the Hindus, reacted upon themselves, and softened the ferocity of the early Arab Proselytism." Apart from this, Indian Muhammadanism was itself affected in another respect, namely it adopted a modified form of caste system among some of the Moslems, the worship of saints and images, a new philosophy and a belief in miracles and silly disputations on points of no earthly interest. "Their celebration of the Mohurrum with tasteless and extravagant ceremonies and their fast in Ramazan" are for example due to the influence of circumjacent idolatry in India.* The new philosophy which Islam is said to have adopted from India can be easily traced in the rational and philosophical cult known as *Sufism*—which though still prevalent in Persia, is declared to have been borrowed mainly from Indian philosophy. As developed by Abul Fazl, it first enjoined on all its disciples, the renunciation of the world and the practice of monastic life. At first, extolling ascetic life, it departed from its original purpose and entered on discussions respecting the divine nature, which in some cases finally led to Pantheism and the Pantheistic Sufis hold opinions greatly similar to those of the followers of Vedanta.

The presence of Islam in India is important in another respect. Every true Indian ought to be proud of the fact that in our mother

§ Barth's 'Religions of India' pp. 243-244.
† Vide H. G. Keene's 'The Moghul Empire" p. 8.

country and mother country *alone*, almost all the great religions of the world are brought together; and therefore if there is any possibility, anywhere, of the rise of a most comprehensive and universal religion, as some of the most advanced thinkers aspire to found, India is the country where conditions are most favourable for it. For with our own eyes, we find Hinduism, Budhism, Jainism, Islam, Zoroastrianism and Christianity in close contact with one another; and as we rub slowly on together, there is every chance of each religion losing its angularities, excrescences, exclusiveness and fanaticism, and this is the real step to the formation of such a comprehensive religion. The very fact that a Parliament of religions as at Chicago and a Convention of all religions, as recently held at Calcutta, are possible to be convened nowadays shows, that the formation of such a universal religion is not such a hopeless task to accomplish, as it seemed a quarter of a century ago. In contributing to the foundation of such a religion in the distant future at least, Islam is sure to play a prominent part along with its sister religions; and India, the cradle of all religions, will, it may be hoped, teach the world the real meaning of the oneness of all religions, which finds expression in the famous and sublime language of the Upanishads—"Ekam Sat Vipra Bahudha Vadanthi."

Let us next see, in what way the Muhammadans contributed to the development of Indian arts, and what permanent contributions to Indian civilization they have made in the shape of buildings and architectural monuments. Despotic governments are generally held to be the least beneficent of governments. But even the oft-despised despotic monarchy carries with it some advantages. No other form of government is better suited to develop the fine arts of a nation and spend so lavishly on those fine arts after the prevalent tastes. The despotic Mussalman rulers were no exception to this rule; for music painting, sculpture, architecture and other kindred arts received liberal and substantial encouragement at the hands of the Moghul emperors. Horticulture as an art owes much to Muhammadan impulse. Fine fruits such as graft mangoes were not of indigenous growth and many of them still bear their Persian names. Indigenous fruits by themselves were of a poor quality in India. It was only in later times, after the foreign conquests began, that fruit culture was regarded an important branch of agriculture. Even in the matter of *cookery* there is much that is of Mussalman introduction. Sweetmeats such as Halva, for which the Northern parts of India are so famous, evidently owe a great deal to the luxurious taste of the splendour loving

Mussalman sovereigns. It need not be specially noted that the manufacture of some of the finest scents whose industry is much localised in certain parts such as Gazipoor, Puducottah &c., was the result of Mussalman patronage.

Again, we are indebted not a little, to the Moghul rule for some of the finest buildings and most beautiful towns which are found in Northern India. To-day, Delhi and Agra and a host of other towns stand as the permanent and the proudest monuments of Mussalman architecture. The beauty and grandeur of the Indian cities like Vizianagar, is also testified to by European travellers like Nicolo de Comte, the Venetian traveller in India about 1420 A. D. It would be legitimate in this connection to describe the evolution of the architectural styles under the Mussalman rule; but considerations of space preclude it. The Saracenic style of architecture was the style adopted by the Muhammadans, when they became the ruling race in India, about the twelfth century. To describe the different styles of their architecture would be impossible in this short resume; for there were more or less ten different styles developed by different local dynasties. The style introduced by them was the modification of the Arab style as developed in Persia. Since the new conquerors did not evidently carry with them a number of artizans, they were naturally obliged to build their mosques and tombs with the aid of Hindu workmen and so in all the varieties of early Mussalman architecture, the distinctive features may be traced at once to the employment of native Hindu workmen and the use of their own materials and methods". "The marks of Hindu workmanship was so apparent that several writers long contended even for the Hindu origin of the famous Kutb minar near Delhi"—the earliest Mussalman structure in India*. But the Indian style was first supplemented and ultimately displaced by foreign ones and about the fifteenth century the Muhammadans had cast off the practice of imitating Hindu styles and began their own methods.

In mentioning a few of the important sovereigns who were enthusiastic builders we have to begin with Alauddin and Firoz Shah. It is stated by Firishta that the latter built not less than 845 public works, canals, dams, reservoirs, bridges, baths, forts, mosques, colleges, monasteries &c, including the "old Jumna Canal". Even allowing much for exaggeration by these panegyrics, we have to admit that under these two monarchs, all sorts of private and public buildings were con-

* "The Imperial Gazetteer" Vol. II. Chp. III. p. 125.

structed. One of the most interesting reliques of Babar's reign is the mosque at Ayodhia; and Akbar built the fort of Agra and the palaces and mosques of Fathpur Sikri. As Jehangir made Lahore his principal residence, Agra and Delhi have nothing which owed anything to his rule and his works at Lahore are Persean in style. Under the splendour-loving Shah Jehan a remarkable change came over the style and Mussalman architecture reached its zenith and "attained a delicate elegance and refinement of detail" unknown in any previous Indian style. He is famous as the builder of the Jama-Musjid, the mosque at Delhi, his great palace at Agra, the Pearl mosque and that marvel of marvels, the Taj-mahal". The beauty and splendour of the Jama Musjid, the Pearl mosque and the Taj" says Mr. Mehta, "compare favourably with the cloud-woven vision of the Alhambra the Alcazar or Guldar" ‡ Speaking of the Taj itself, which is India's great Pride, Mr. Fergusson writes—"Perhaps in the whole world, there is not a scene where nature and art so successfully combine to produce a perfect art, as within the precincts of this far-famed Mausoleum* * No words can express the chastened beauty of that central chamber. Seen in the soft gloom of the subdued light, that reached it through the distant and half-closed openings that surround it * * it is the most graceful and most impressive of the sepulchres of the world"¶ The main characteristics of Shah Jehan's buildings are simplicity, plainness, sobriety and refinement of taste, largely due to the geometric marble inlay and the Florentine style of mosaic; which last during Shah Jehan's, reign almost superseded all other styles. The localization of this pretty handicraft is a good example of the benefits which the Indian arts have so often gained by intercourse with outside nations and the importation of foreign ideas and designs." The beauty of many of these buildings consists also chiefly in large domes, and fine arches above massive pillars.

One noteworthy feature of the reign of Akbar and his successors was their liberal patronage of painters; more than a hundred of them kept by Akbar are said to have attained perfection in the art. It is said that the Moghul school of painting was to some extent inspired by European and Persian models and that besides them paintings in Chinese style were found in his palaces. Sir T. Roe himself was much struck by the facility with which foreign pictures and manufactures

‡ See the article 'On the influence of Islam' in a weekly edition of the illustrated "Times of India" Jan. 1907.

¶ "History of Indian Architecture" pp. 575-598.

were copied by the craftsmen of the imperial household.* Painting as a fine art became a diversion for the Moghul emperors and their nobles. The artists of the courts of Akbar aud Jehangir and Shah Jehan, both Hindu and Muhammadan, were greatly encouraged in drawing and painting portraits, in illustrating legend and history or contemporary life, both in *fresco* on the walls of palaces and villas and in exquisite *miniature paintings* on paper and parchment, which were preserved like valuable manuscripts; and to this day some of them are found. These Indian miniatures were carried to Europe and they supplied materials for European painters like *Rembrandt* of Dutch fame, a contemporary of Jehangir.¶

In addition to the forms of style above described, and the modes of ornamentation such as frescoes, miniatures, mosaic ornamentation &c., we owe to the Mussalman rulers, the art of embellishing buildings by the application of enamelled tyles" introduced through Persia from Assyria and Babylonia—an art probably now extinct in India; and also the introductiou of "glass mosaics" like those found in Ambur and Udaipur palaces; and the art of decorating jade-vessels with gems, which is said to be an invention of the Moghul period due either to the European or Indian Jewellers in the service of the Moghul Court.§ In concluding this part, it may be pointed out that the art of the Moghuls was not suppressed by, and did not die with the Moghul dynasty, for though like our modern art, it was divorced from religion and regarded by the court only as a distraction and amusement, it quickly grafted itself on to the older Budhist and Hindu Schools and thus became truly Indian—a national tradition and part of (Indian) national culture."‡ The combination of Muhammadan and Hindu styles of architecture, has produced the famous Indo-Saracenic style, in which the sublimity and the law of nature of the Hindus, and the beauty and finish of the previous native art, and the plainness, harmonious colouring and superb architecture of the Mussalmans are mingled together—as illustrated in some of the buildings of Ahmadabad which are declared even by Mr. Fergusson to be the most characteristic ol all and to be essentially Indian.

Let us now pass on to the influence which the Mussalmans exerted on the language, literature aud Indian culture in general. The Arabs

* "Imperial Gazetteer" vol. II. Chp. III by V. A. Smith pp. 130-131.

¶ "Indian Sculpture and Painting" by E. B. Havell. p. 188.

§ *Vide* 'The Imperial Gazetteer vol. II. Chp. III. p. 133.

‡ E. B. Havell's 'Indian Sculpture and Painting' pp. 225-226.

who traded with India before the later Muhammadan conquests, were, in fact, a connecting link between India and the western world. They transmitted to Europe Indian culture and the ideas it worked out. It is said that at the Court of Bagdad, Indians used to expound philosophy and science and medicine of the Hindus. Averroes the great Arab philosopher is said to have spread in Europe the Hindu philosophy and the Arabian records disclose the fact that in the eighth century, Haroun-al-Rashid retained two Hindu Physicians in his Court, known as Manka and Salch. Moreover it was owing to the close connection between Mussalman sovereigns and their Hindu subjects that Muhammadan writers and scholars like Alberuni were able to translate Sanskrit works including the Puranas and thus render Hindu culture familiar to the west. The Numerals, that the west now uses, were introduced by the Arabs from India. Speaking of the influence of India upon the west, V. A. Smith wrote in the "East and West"—"We owe to India an invention of supreme importance; when we write "1905", few of us are conscious, that the familiar figures are the result of an intellectual feat, performed by a nameless genius in India, probably an astronomer of Ujjain in central India, about the sixth century. Indian invention of the decimal system, the discovery of the use of nought or cypher, equipped mankind with an adequate instrument for mathematical researches. In the seventh and eighth centuries, it passed from India to Persea and soon to the court of Haroun-al-Raschid the Khalif of Bagdad. All the old system of Arithmetical notation along with the Roman numerals which are familiar to us, are clumsy and inefficient. Thence the knowledge was handed on to Europe through the Mussalman conquerors of South Spain and we called the Decimal notation, the "Arabic figures". In this way, Indian culture was taken to the west by the Mussalmans.

When we consider the influence of India upon the west, we must not disregard the opposite tendency. The Arabs were the means, by which western knowledge and culture was taken to our country, just as at the present day Englishmen are the means of spreading occidental knowledge in the East. The influence was therefore mutual and not one sided. The Greek philosophy and culture and the science of Medicine were all brought to India by the Muhammadans. In short they formed a connecting link between the East and the West.

Among other things, the desire for writing *history*, properly so called, which, if it ever existed here, existed but in the crude form of the Puranas, the Ithihasas and the like was the creation of the Mussal-

man chroniclers. They were fond of noting down the events of their daily lives. They had sufficient sense of their self-importance to preserve their own history. The Hindu mind, for reasons unknown, did not turn its attention much to such a worldly subject as history-writing. This is probably the cause of the dearth of reliable historical sources for the pre-Mussalman period of Indian history. On the other hand many of the Moghul emperors, like Babar, have left behind them valuable records of their own lives or kept chroniclers like Abul Fazl, by their side, who have noted down important events. It may be safely said, therefore, that it is the Mussalman, who taught us for the first time, the art of preserving records of contemporary history.

As early as Akbar's reign and even earlier, Persian had become the state language. Todar Mal, Akbar's famous minister, enacted that all government accounts must be kept in Persian, instead of in Hindi. Thus he forced his co-religionists to study the court language—an innovation like that introduced by Macaulay in modern times. Todar Mal's order and Akbar's generous policy of promoting Hindus to the highest honours, led to two important results :—firstly the Hindus, ere long, began to teach Mussalmans in this language and secondly a new Vernacular "compounded of the languages of Shah Namah and the Ramayana arose in upper India—the Urdu language now spoken by many millions.

We can also infer the indelible influence which the centuries of their rule and the presence of a vast Mussalman population in India had left upon our country, from the many hundreds of popular words and terms which can be picked up from each Vernacular and which are originally derived from Arabic or Persian. Of all such Vernacular languages Hindi is the most influenced in this respect. Even in the far off South, we notice many words used commonly in administration and legal phraseology:—viz; Rastha (Road), Thana (gaol) Jamadar, Subhadar, Havildar, Harikar, Taluq, Fouzdar, Dewan, Peishkar &c. These are only a few among hundreds and thousands of such words.

The influence of Muhammadan rule upon the language and literature of the Hindus is profound. Urdu literature which saw its birth in the sixteenth century and which then extended itself and got encouragement under the Northern school, drew its inspiration from Persean. Similarly the Kashmere language has an old literature mainly religious, which has since produced some imitations of Persean poetry under Mussalman domination* Above all, the Hindi, especially

* Vide Chp. IX by G. A. Grierson in the 'Imperial Gazetteer' Vol. II pp. 429-30.

the Eastern Hindi literature, has some works which show the high water-mark of Mussalman influence. Malik Muhammad, a Mussalman (1540. A. E.) wrote the famous Padmavathi, dedicated to Sher Shah; and this masterpiece which is remarkable for its originality of subject and poetical beauty is an allegorical poem founded on the historical siege and capture of Chittore by Ala-uddin in 1303 and is said to breathe the Hindu air throughout. This furnishes only one instance out of the numerous works, forming the combined product of Hindu and Mussalman culture, that may be found in abundance in North India.

Speaking of influence in the work-a-day world, we may note among others, the introduction of horse-breeding and horsemanship. If we exclude those mentioned in the Puranas, there would appear to have been no good breed of horses, indigenous to India. The Mussalman sovereigns introduced fine Arab horses into India. The peculiar breed, called 'mules' is probably the result of this introduction of foreign breeds. From this time onward horse-breeding became prevalent in India and in consequence a revolution in the art of war took place. Cavalry fighting was developed and it became an important element in Indian warfare.

We may also notice the changes, if there be any, on the manners and dress and on Hindu society in general. As a result of contact with Mussalmans, we have acquired a number of customs and manners, which have become so deep-rooted that we cannot even trace their origin. Most probably the particular mode of salutation by raising the hand to the forehead, and the habit of wearing turbans, are of Muhammadan origin and now universally followed.

Again the caste-ridden Hindus, must have acquired a sense of civil equality between the various classes by being in contact with the Mussalman for a long time. For instance, there is a feeling of brotherhood among all Mussalmans, which we Hindus sadly lack. All differences in creed and wealth, are blotted out, as it were, by the utterance of the formula "*There is no God but God and Muhammad is his prophet.*" This recognition of a brotherhood among themselves has a tendency to influence those who come in contact with them. Moreover as Sister Nivedita says "Since orthodox Hinduism is a little too barren of all luxury, and a little too much hemmed in by requirements and considerations of the highest notions, the liberalising influence of Islam is of some social usage‡." The strictness of Hindu customs has been softened by their contact with Islam.

‡ "Web of Indian life" Sister Nivedita p. 252.

Along with so many beneficent results, pointed out in the foregoing pages, Mussalman rule is said to have introduced into India the Zenana and the Purdah system with all their concomitant evils. This system of the seclusion of woman is dying out under the beneficent influence of Western ideals and civilization; even where it is still prevalent, it does not exist with the same rigour, except, perhaps, in some Native Courts. In this connection we should remember that among the lower orders of society the Purdah system *had not been and is not* prevalent, for the obvious reason that they are forced by poverty to follow their husbands out, to earn their days' wages. Whether the people adopted this custom as a protection against the violence of the ruling race or copied it out as a fashionable custom as Anglicised Indians of to-day adopt European customs and manners, it is certain that the system, as found in India, is of Mussalman origin. It must have first permeated the wealthiest classes and must have then spread to all other classes; for it exists with more rigour among the high castes and with most rigour among the wealthiest, including the ruling classes. One proof, if proof be wanted, to show that it is a case of Mussalman introduction is that in places where their influence was feeble and of short duration or even absent totally, the system is not rigorous or not prevalent at all. When compared with Bengal, Madras and Bombay were less influenced by Muhammadan power and so the system is not so rigorous in these parts and in our own state Travancore, which never came under Mussalman sway, the system is not prevalent at all. One of the European travellers in India about the seventeenth century wrote that women moved about in close palanquins; but in Masulipatam, he says, where Mussalman rule was not much felt in his days, there was not that strictness and women went about freely. Again, ancient Sanskrit literature contains much evidence to show that the seclusion of women was not prevalent in Vedic, Budhistic or Puranic periods. When we say that the Purdah system was unknown in Ancient India, "we must not understand that a Hindu woman met men outside her kindred, with the freedom and frankness of her western sister. The anecdote of Lakshmana having never seen the body of Seetha above her anklets, tells its own tale."† As Mr. Ameer Ali points out the Purdah system in vogue in many moslem countries was not prevalent in Arabia among the Arabs. He says "that among the Republican moslems, women moved freely in public, attended the sermons of the Caliph and lectures of Ali-Ibn-Abbas and

† "The Web of Indian life" p. 76.

others." It must have come to them later on, probably from Central Asia, or more probably from the Byzantines or the Persean Court.

In this connection, to omit to make a mention of the work of Akbar to reform Hindu society would be quite unjustifiable. He tried to forbid child marriages, animal sacrifices and trial by ordeal. He permitted the remarriage of widows and set his face against the custom of Sathi and gave considerable facilities for the intermingling of races. All these reflect credit upon the shrewd and beneficent rule of Akbar. His work in these and other directions may be summed up in the following words of Kennedy. "Though the empire itself went down, the methods of Government, some of which were introduced by him and some of which were developed and systematised from older methods have still held their own and are the basis of British rule. That each person should be taxed according to his ability, that there should be shown no exemption or favour as regards this, that equal justice should be meted out and external foes kept at bay, that every man should be at liberty to believe what he pleases without any interference by the state with his conscience; such are some of the principles upon which British Government in India rests, such are its real boast and strength. But all these principles were those of Akbar and to him remains the undying glory of having been the first in Hindustan to put them into practice. These rules now underlie all modern Western States, but few of even such states can boast that these principles are as thoroughly carried out by them in this, the twentieth century as they were by Akbar himself more than 300 years ago."¶

Having thus dealt with many phases of the same question, let us conclude with a few general observations. We have seen that Islam, wherever it went, proved itself very powerful and active and living. In Africa, Central Asia and Western Asia, the native population were all civilized only through the civilizing influence of Islam; though for other reasons these regions now seem to have fallen on evil days. In India the case was indeed different, but even here, it has been shown that it both influenced and was, in turn, influenced by, Hinduism in several respects. In spite of this fact, the Afghan and Moghul rule continually extending from about 1206 to 1707 or even after, did not change the rooted character of the people, which remains as it was before. The Hindus long accustomed to foreign invasions regarded the Muhammadan invasion, as only one of the series of waves, that had passed over the surface of the society without affecting the great

¶ "The history of the Great Moghuls" by Kennedy *Vol.* I, p. 311.

masses to any marked extent. "The conquerors of India" writes Lane Poole, "have come in hordes, again and again, but they have scarcely touched the soul of the people. The Indian is still, in general what he always was, in spite of them all. . . . . . One can with difficulty imagine any serious change in the rooted character and time-honoured instincts of the vast mass of the people. . . . "

"The East bowed low before the Blast,
In patient deep disdain;
She let the legions thunder past,
And plunged in thought again."

He further adds that the dynasty of Babar ended in nothingness like all its predecessors. The Muhammadan ascendancy in Hindustan. . . . . left few traces of its long duration."‡ The Hindus were able to preserve their distinctiveness and their rooted character owing among others, to three great causes:—(1) Their numerical superiority. (2) Their want of political cohesion—this stood them in good stead when once they had an enemy anxious to subdue them. It was that enemy's interest to have found all the heads of his opponents on one's neck, but the reverse was to our interest. (3) The Hindu ancientness and exclusiveness. All these three elements stood in the way of total Islamization of the Hindus.

But though the Hindu retains his nationality and the Muhammadan his, in some respects they have learned to pull smoothly on together from the days of the Moghuls. As matters stand at present, however, the relations between these two important sections, though not completely strained, are far from satisfactory, especially in certain portions of Northern India. Both have many points of difference, but many more in common. In matters of numerical strength, and probably education, the Hindus are on a vantage ground. But in the matter of unity and strength among themselves, and in the matter of outside support they are likely to get by the new Pan-Islamic spirit abroad, the Mussalmans have advantages over us. As Mr. Gokhale once said, "Among the Muhammadans, in spite of individual and sectarian differences, the lowest man can rise to the highest position whereas among the Hindus they are caste-ridden, handicapped and confined to the field of their birth and surrounded by impassable barriers on all sides." In some respects. again, both are equally ill off and women's condition in the society and also economic and political disabilities may be instanced as bearing on the point. On the other

‡ "Mediæval India" by Stanley Lane Poole pp. 422-24.

hand, "there is a tradition of antagonism" which has never been overcome. On these grounds, we need hardly argue the need or the use of the union of these two large and influential sections of Indian population; that is quite manifest. That being so, the question is how to do it? One of the best means is to bring light to bear upon the past and read the right lessons therefrom. If this small attempt has shown something of that kind, it will have ensured its purpose quite well. Finally, if only these two communities are anxious to co-operate and unite for a common purpose, if only we will take a broader and nobler view of things, having the advancement of the mother country, in our heart of hearts, if only, we will love our country more than all, and lastly, if only, we will cultivate a habit of forbearance and broadminded sympathy, if, instead of hurling criticisms on the weakness of others, we learn to appreciate the better sides of both,—for, this tendency to unnecessarily point out the weakness of others, ignoring the other side of the picture, is the chief cause of more than half the animosity between man and man—and, above all, if India can produce more leaders, possessed of the qualities of head and heart, to guide the respective communities, then the future of India will surely become brighter and more hopeful.

A. KRISHNA AIYAR.

TOLSTOY THE MAN AND THE MEANING OF LIFE.

By Prof. Kamkhya Nath Mitra, M. A., B. L.

THE eighty-first anniversary of the birth of Count Tolstoy furnishes an opportunity for reviewing the career of one of the greatest men of the world. If there is any man in Europe to-day standing head and shoulder above his contemporaries, a veritable giant among a race of pigmies, with a message and a philosophy destined to revolutionise the thought of mankind, that man is Tolstoy. In loftiness of soul, intensity of feeling, earnestness of purpose, courage of conviction, abounding humanity, prophetic vision, profound spirituality and effective greatness, we know not where to find his equal from Dan to Beersheba. No man in recent times has thought more, felt more, suffered more, struggled more and sacrificed more than the venerable, octogenerian sage of Russia whose stately figure, majestic mien, flowing beard and god-like brow remind one of the Reeshis of India and inspire one with a feeling of reverential awe such as nothing else can. He already counts as his disciples myriads of men and women in different parts of the world and Yasnaya Polyana has already become a place of pilgrimage to thousands of thirsty souls from abroad. To some, he is, like Isaiah, a great prophet who has again brought to men the first true notes of relgion, or a John the Baptist, the forerunner of a new kingdom on earth. A classic in his life-time, there is no department of art or thought to which he has not made ample and substantial contribution. A great novelist, a poet, a dramatist, an art-critic, a social and political philosopher, an eminent Educationist, a theologian, and, above all, a saint and a seer——such is Count Tolstoy. His Gospel is the Gospel of work, faith and love. His ideal is plain living high thinking and hard working. He is as modest as he is honest and his fame has not spoiled him as it spoils the lesser lights who care for nothing but fame. Born in a noble family, reared in profusion and luxury, he does not despise manual work, but ploughs his own land and mends his own shoes like an ordinary peasant and a common cobbler. His fame has spread far and wide as a champion of the people's rights and as their helper in need, for he it is who was the leading spirit in relieving the distress of the starving millions when in 1891 Russia was in the grip of a terrible famine and because he it is whose voice has been raised, bold and clear, against the wrongs perpetrated by State and Church, Czar and Priest. He has cast in his lot

with the peasant. He loves the *mujik* and the *mujik* loves him. Like Rousseau he has idealised the tiller of the soil—and as Rousseau was the precursor of the French Revolution, so Tolstoy may be regarded as the herald of a world-revolution that has yet to be. Like Rousseau, he has intensity of feeling, vividness of imagination and burning love for his fellow-men, but in loftiness of soul, amplitude of genius and strength of character he leaves Rousseau far in the rear. Like all great men it has been his misfortune to be misunderstood in his time. Some charge him with a vague idealism, though his position he has defined clearly enough. By some he has been called a rank anarchist, though his mission is one of peace and love. By the fanatical priests of Russia he has been called Antichrist incarnate, and we know that that distinction had been conferred upon Martin Luther as well. By the Czar and his emissaries he is looked upon as a fire-brand and during the last political struggle that gave Russia a Duma, the innocent Count Tolstoy was deported from his country to the lasting disgrace of bureaucratic despotism. It may be, a bloody revolution was somehow connected with his noble teaching, but Count Tolstoy is no more responsible for it than Christ is responsible for the French Revolution. Christianity is no doubt a democratic religion, but was it not blasphemous of Danton to have called Jesus the great Sansculotte and to have stated before the revolutionary tribunal on the eve of his execution that he was as old as the Messiah at the time of his crucifixion ?

If the above be a true estimate of Tolstoy the Man, then no subject can interest us more at the present moment. It is good for us to be here. To us, in India, Tolstoy is a more interesting study than anywhere else in the world for the simple reason that there is a close resemblance between the conditions of life in Russia and in India. Russia has been called an enigma as India was called an enigma the other day by Lord Rosebury—and Russia has been called "half Asia", that is, partly Europe and partly Asia which, I hope, is not a barbarian mass. Renaissance, Reformation, French Revolution swept like a hurricane over the continent of Europe, but Russia, like Rip Van Winkle, did not even turn in her sleep and yawn. The Russian of the upper class may be steeped in Western culture like the University-bred young man of India to-day, but it has not touched the heart of the nation any more than in India. And the soul of Count Tolstoy ?—Why, it is the soul of a great Asian looking on with calm indifference at the tinsel glitter of the civilisation of the West—its mammoth armaments, formidable dreadnoughts, petty rivalries, rattling factories,

roaring looms, deafening racket, distracting hurry, craze for getting on, appalling juxtaposition of bloated wealth and squalid want, buying in the cheapest market and selling in the dearest, spheres of influence, cant of 'open door', dirty diplomacy, strident Imperialism, national palavers, electioneering tricks, ballot-box and universal suffrage with balderdash and beer. It is a soul closely allied to the soul of a Buddha, a Confucius, a Christ, a Mahomet. We may not agree with Count Tolstoy in all that he has said, but I hope half-an-hour spent with him will not be spent in vain.

Count Tolstoy was born on the 9th of September, 1828. The Tolstoys came originally from Germany where they bore the name of Dickman, Tolstoy being its Russian translation. The date of their migration cannot be ascertained with accuracy, nor do we know much about the early family history. The founder of the family, Peter Anderejevitch, the first Count Tolstoy, flourished in the reign of Peter the great and was appointed ambassador to the Porte for his signal services to that epoch-making monarch. He was a man of blood and iron, and had a stormy and chequered career before him. We hear of his complicity in the political plot in the cause of Sofia, his incarceration and severe suffering in Turkey, and his return to his country in a piteous condition. The magnanimous Czar, however, repaired his fortune by making a lavish grant of offices and money, and once more he rose rapidly in favour and became the most trusted servant of his king and master. With the death of Peter the Great his stars declined. Peter II. viewed him with suspicion and banished him to a cloister near Archangel, where he died on the 17th of February, 1729. The first Count Tolstoy was the great-grandfather of the great-grandfather of the subject of this sketch, Count Leo Nikolajevitch, the seventh Count Tolstoy, who may have inherited his literary tastes from his great progenitor to whom are attributed some works which show him to have had no mean talent as an author and a translator. The son of this first Count also died in exile. There is nothing particular to be mentioned about the third Count and the fourth Count, but the fifth Count Tolstoy was a famous soldier and is renowned for his great heroism in battle. Of Tolstoy's father there is nothing remarkable to be recorded. He was an average man of his class intellectually and morally, and married a rich heiress, the mother of our hero, a faithful wife, a good mother, and an earnest Christian, worthy of her illustrious son who has felt her influence all his life and has mentioned her with inimitable pathos and affection in his story,

"My childhood". Count Tolstoy was the fourth son and was one year and a half old when his mother died. The mother left a new-born babe, a little girl, Maria, and only seven years later the five children were completely orphaned by the death of their father. The three younger children were committed to the charge of a distant relative with their aunt as guardian. This aunt also died within four years and the duty of guardian devolved upon a second aunt whose husband happened to have an estate near Kazan, the seat of a University—a circumstance which determined the plan of his education there. She was a very kind-hearted lady and Count Tolstoy never speaks of her except in terms of reverence and gratitude. The following description of the good old lady is highly amusing. I quote the very language of Tolstoy: "She was a very kind and pious person, pious after the fashion of her time, performing assiduously all the rites of the Church, without being conscious of any special duty toward her fellow-men. or any necessity of a change of character on her part." Characteristic of her and her social circle was also the wish which she expressed for her foster-son, "that he might have a *liaison* with a woman, as that gave a man a necessary experience".

After this brief digression let me resume the thread of my narrative. But before I follow Count Tolstoy through the tortuous course of Kazan University, I must not omit to notice a few traits of his childhood and of the period of his transition from childhood to adolescence. The child is father of the man. Some of the lineaments of manhood are early discerned in the child. Count Tolstoy was naturally a thoughtful child and his thoughtfulness was developed by the great sorrow that hung over his cradle and haunted his memory. Even at eleven years old we see him a perfect master of Sartorial philosophy, thinking like our eccentric friend, Herr Terifelsdrœckh, but without a touch of his misanthrophy. The incident on which he moralises turns upon his emergence from childhood into boyhood, when his tender, little aunt took off his baby clothes and put on him coat and trousers. To quote Count Tolstoy: "I could see that she felt as I did; she was sorry for me, but we both knew it had to be; and for the first time I felt that life was not a plaything but a serious matter." My Lord Byron also knew at thirty-three that life is a serious matter. But what is the moral he draws?

"Life is a serious matter,
"Therefore, for God's sake hock and Soda-water."

That is the difference between Byron the Man and Tolstoy the Boy.

Another trait in the character of this child was his extreme sensitiveness. Says his aunt: "He gave promise of being a very homely boy, and kept his promise so well that his looks separated him from other children, creating in him a sensitiveness which both refined and embittered his life." This sensitiveness was good for him. I do not say that all sensitiveness must necessarily be good, for I believe that a healthily constituted man must be a little pachydermatous. He must give and take, lick and be licked. But I fully agree with Ruskin in the sentiment he has conveyed in the following lines: ".You have heard many outcries against sensation lately; but, I can tell you, it is not less sensation we want, but more. The ennobling difference between one man and another is precisely this, that one man feels more than another......sensation *is* good for us; nay, we are only human in so far as we are sensitive, and honour is precisely in proportion to our passion." Count Tolstoy was a sensitive child because he is great, and he is great because he is sensitive. There are sensibilities and sensibilities. There is nothing morbid about Tolstoy's sensitiveness. It afforded him a vantage-ground because it kept him somewhat aloof from the concerns of the world, enabling him to see it better than those in the thick of the fray; it gave him a sense of detachment and disengagement from the vanities of life absolutely necessary to a philosophic mind; but it never alienated his interest from the great questions of his time or made him like Diogenes live in a tub. It only enabled him, in the words of Emerson, "to keep his head in solitude and hand in society."

Another characteristic of Tolstoy's childhood was his deep love of Nature—a love that has tinged the whole web of his life. I hold that this love of Nature is another measure of a man's greatness. To Wordsworth

> "The meanest flower that blows could give
> "Thoughts that do often lie too deep for tears."

And as this love of Nature made Wordsworth love Cumberland and its shepherds, so this love has made Tolstoy love the *mujik* of Russia as the flesh of his flesh and the blood of his blood. It has deepened the democratic current of his thought and pushed back the bounds of his democratic vista. The woods, the streams and the fields of Yasnaya Polyana were dear to his heart as nothing else was dear, but the poor boy had to say good-bye to them all and hasten to the dull and dusty city of Kazan, for education required that it must be. He might as well say as he said when he first

put on his coat and trousers, that he was sorry for it, but he knew that it had to be and so submitted to the inevitable.

It is in the year 1842 that we see Count Tolstoy a fresh-man at Kazan University. The old chapter of the book of his life is closed and a new chapter begins. The academical career of Count Tolstoy must be of special interest to the student community of India, but I am sorry to say that Tolstoy never figured high at the examinations and never got any prize or medal or took a first-class either. He jogged on somehow; and after four years' residence at the University, left it abruptly without even a Bachelor's degree to bless his soul. I regret to say it, but I am afraid, there is something fundamentally wrong in the constitution of the Universities all over the world that is repugnant to the genius of the best youth of their times. I do not know how it is, but if we except a few notable instances like Milton, Johnson or Gladstone, all the literati and men of action who have left an indelible stamp on the thoughts of mankind and the face of the world, have had very little to do with or have *not* taken kindly to the inflexible system of University education. It seems that genius cannot flourish on the soil of an academy. Dry-as-dustism, wooden pedantry and bombastic trivialities are the only plants that grow there in rank luxuriance. As for the University snobs, I leave them to the uncovenanted mercies of William Makepeace Thackeray. 'Our benign mother' proves more often step-motherly than otherwise. Even Milton writes: "Cambridge which as in the time of her better health and mine own younger judgment, I never greatly admired, so now much less." Even scholars in a technical sense do not always fare better. Matthew Arnold took nothing better than a second-class and Cardinal Newman only a third-class. No wonder then that Count Tolstoy makes no secret of his aversion to his *Alma Mater*. He bangs her even.

It may sound a bit paradoxical, but the fact is that Tolstoy did not shine at the University, because he is a Tolstoy. He is not one of your academical Ixions riveted to the revolving wheel of a regular curriculum. He must follow his bent and his studies must be erratic. He is an eagle and must fly. You cannot clip the wings of genius. Have we not seen many young men in the course of our experience passing low or getting plucked not because they are dunces, but because they know more, think more and feel more? Have we not seen many young men who might have bloomed into Gold-medallists and flaunted their ribbons if only they had cared to limit the range of their studies and aspiration

of their soul? They would have done very well indeed if only they had cared to glue their eyes to the musty pages of the dog-eared books conventionally prescribed by a stolid University and had never lifted them up to the sky or lowered them down to the earth to receive the iufluences of Nature and Life. But I say it deliberately that *they* are the gainers in the long run. I do not say that University education is an evil in itself but what I do say is that the real work you do at college and the real thought you think at college are the only things that count and not the parchment scroll you get at the Convocation.

The thought that recurred to Count Tolstoy over and over again was this: What is the meaning of life? What am I? Whence? Whither? When he took up a book, he asked himself: Where does it lead? Is the light that flickers there the light of Heaven or a Will-o'-the-wisp? When he read History, he asked himself: What is the meaning of History? What is Human Progress? Count Tolstoy perhaps never heard the words, Light and Sweetness and *Epiekeia*; but when he studied Literature, I have no doubt he asked himself: Is that all? Is that the *summum bonum* of life? There are very few books and very few lectures that can stand this crucial test of an inquisitive soul. The "budge doctors" of Kazan University could never answer these questions satisfactorily in their life. How could they, poor beavers? The divine discontent of Tolstoy grew from more to more. He kept apart, enquired within and earned the nickname of "philosopher" and "recluse", as more than two centuries ago, the sobriquet of "The Lady of Christ's" had been earned by another great man in another clime—the celebrated poet of the Paradise Lost and the great champion of England's liberty.

The situation was getting from bad to worse till at last it became quite intolerable. On the 12th of April, 1847, Tolstoy petitioned the dean to permit him to withdraw from the University on account of failing health and personal affairs. On the 14th, he received his papers and left Kazan for Yasnaya Polyana.

One question here naturally arises: How is it that Tolstoy born in a Christian country never learnt the Meaning of Life? The answer is somewhat difficult but I will try to give it as far as I can. It may be a blunt truth, but, to begin with, I maintain that countries calling themselves Christian are not necessarily Christian. There is a world of difference between practical Christianity and the word of the Gospel, pure and undefiled. It is the Christian spirit that makes a

man Christian and not blind adherence to the dogmas of the Church or mere subscription to the articles of faith. It is not going to Church but doing the will of God that is the essence of Christianity. We have heard the word Christian used in the sense of a white man. I have read of an English groom—I do not exactly remember where—strongly opining that his bay horse kicks just like a Christian. We have heard and read of so many kinds of Christianity—including even that of the muscular brand. We have heard recently of liberal Imperialism, whatever that may mean, and, I should not wonder in the least if one fine morning we rise to hear of Christian Imperialism ready to supplant that hideous cross whose brag and bounce are no less odious than those of rabid jingoism, pure and simple. The jarring sectaries of the western world angrily fly at each other's throat and exchange such soothing amenities as the Scarlet Woman and Babylonian Whore When we see this ugly spectacle we involuntarily cry out: Good Heavens! Save us from this: It is not the God of the Bible but your delirious ego that you worship. First "Lessen your denominator" my friend. "Unless my Algebra deceives me, even one divided by zero gives infinite......Would, in this world of ours, is as mere zero to should, and for most part as the smallest of fractions even to Shall". So says a mighty prophet of the Nineteenth Century.

Count Tolstoy did not learn this truth at once; nor did he know then that Where Love Is, There God Is Also. He had to pass through a great moral struggle and fever-paroxysm of doubt before he saw the straight path leading to the Haven of Rest and Abode of Peace. There may be

"More faith in honest doubt
"Than in half the creeds of the world";

but that is not the kind of faith that satisfies the craving of the soul. Count Tolstoy had begun to doubt when he was only eleven years old. The prevailing religion of Russia is the Greek Church of Christianity. That was the religion of Tolstoy's family. The method of true Christianity as of all true religions is inward and not external. "The kingdom of Heaven is within you". That is the message of Christ. But there is no trace of this teaching in the Greek Church of Russia. It is a huge mass of formalism, superstition and mummery and when Tolstoy looked around him he saw that the people were blind followers of custom, performing like his aunt all the rites of the Church without being conscious of any special duty toward their fellow-men or any necessity of a change of character on their part, and perhaps think-

ing like her that *liaison* with a woman gave a man a necessary experience. Count Tolstoy was a thoughtful boy and could not do things and believe things simply because they were generally done and believed. He exercised his judgment, saw that everything was hollow within and his faith in the Greek Church was destroyed for ever. It was just at this time that a boy—I strongly suspect he was very fond of stealing jam and bird's-nesting—came to Tolstoy and communicated to him as the latest bit of news a discovery which had been made at the Gymnasium. "This discovery" to quote the words of Tolstoy, "was that there was no God, and everything which we were taught was a mere fabrication. I remember how my elder brothers were interested in that news and how they called me to council, and all of us were very much excited about it and received that information as something exceedingly interesting and quite probable."

With his faith in the national church thus undermined and his faith even in the existence of God very much shaken, Count Tolstoy, like many a young man of New India, went to the University. But unlike many a young man, he did not end in levity and grin, because he was an earnest seeker after truth wherever that might lead him. Nor did he like many a young man at Oxford in the days of the Tractarian Movement, only to spare himself the trouble of thinking, slide back into an effete dogma--because he was not invertebrate. The saving elements of his character were a passion for goodness and a burning desire to know the meaning of life. We have seen that the Kazan University had nothing to tell him about this meaning of life. Let us see if he found an answer elsewhere.

But it was long before the answer came. In the meantime he did what most people do under such circumstances. "He must mix with action lest he should die of despair." He took a firm resolve to live for the peasants and work with them. Of his experiences at this period he speaks frankly in his auto-biographical sketch, "Mornings of a Landed Proprietor." His experiences, however, were not happy. There was a wide gulf that separated the Russian peasant from his landlord who was notoriously absentee, lived in Moscow, St. Petersburg or the capitals of Europe, where he thoughtlessly spent the wealth raised by the honest *mujik* by the sweat of his brow and who came to his estate to screw out more when his funds were exhausted in the pursuit of pleasure. There was thus a total want of confidence between the landlord and the peasant. The peasant was a serf, a chattel in the eyes of his owner, his noble instincts completely crushed by

centuries of woe upon his shoulders. Tolstoy determined to work as a redeeming force among these demoralised peasants. To quote his words: "I have thought much about my responsibilities in the future. I have set up certain maxims for my actions, and if God will give me life and strength, my plans shall be carried out." He set about the business in right earnest, but unfortunately his plans fell through. He built model houses for the peasants to live in; erected schools for their children's education; taught them the necessity of agricultural improvement; but all this was of no avail. The plans failed because the Russian peasant like his brother in India is exremely impassive and conservative to the back-bone. When the peasants were asked to remove to the model houses, they said: "Pray, leave us here; do not drive us out of our nest into a strange world"—the strange world being not a mile distant from the centre of the village. When they were asked to fertilise the soil, they said. "Your honour, it is not the manure which makes the the grain grow, but God, God does everything". This sort of appeal to God is only a trick to avoid work. Tolstoy knew it well and felt sadness at heart. The stolid apathy of the peasant caused not only grave disappointment to Tolstoy but filled his mind with shame, because he clearly perceived that centuries of slavery had brought the *mujik* to this miserable pass. He wanted to lose himsilf by doing his duty to his followmen, but this was not to be. He goes to St. Petersburgh where his surroundings prove too strong for him so that he spends the nights boozing and the days sleeping and tries to deaden his conscience by strong drink. But a conscience such as his cannot be deadened. Its sharp reproach pierces his soul like a blade of steel and in a fit of agony he wishes to run away from civilisation like the hero of Locksley Hall.

Count Tolstoy actually runs away and in the year 1851 we find him in the Caucasus. This change was good for him, for it is here that he came to himself, though the full meaning of Life did not dawn upon him for sometime to come. To quote the words of his biographer, Prof. Steiner: "Here was the prodigal's "far country" in which "no man gave unto him." Here he learned to know that large and sorrowful company, the ills of the human race,—hunger, cold, hardship, sickness, danger, death and fear of death. It is here that nature spoke to him in human terms. In its beauty and power, in its heights and depths he saw the divine forces; not as opiates for dreams and artificial ecstasies, but forces for human redemption." Let me add to this that it is here that the bitter experience began which made him an

apostle of peace, for it is here that he received his baptism of fire and first saw war not as a gilded pageant or a work of art, but in all its hideous and naked deformity. It is here again that he laid the foundation of his fame as an author.

One day while Count Tolstoy was aimlessly wandering about the solitary regions of the Caucasus in company with a Cossack, he suddenly came across with a near relative, a military officer and an adjutant to the commanding general, who persuaded Tolstoy to enter the army. Count Tolstoy became a noncommissioned officer in an artillery regiment stationed on the banks of the Terek River to reduce to subjection a hardy tribe of mountaineers who always fought for freedom with the tenacity of bull-dogs. Count Tolstoy fought as his grandfather had fought long before him and was conspicuous for his gallantry, but the whistling bullets and the clash of arms, sickening scenes of carnage and slaughter, revealed to him the horrors of war, intensified his love of bucolic life and produced a revulsion of feeling that made him cling to the memory of Yasnaya Polyana with its woods and streams and simple peasant folk. We must bear in mind that but for this experience of Tolstoy the International Court of Arbitration at Hague would never have been an accomplished fact.

It is in the Caucasus again that Tolstoy laid the foundation of his literary fame. On the 5th of July, 1852, he sent the story "My childhood" to St. Petersburg where it was readily received as the first attempt of a great genius. "The Mornings of a Land-owner," "My Boyhood", the sequel of "My Childhood," "My Manhood," a fragment, "The Sortie, the story of a Volunteer," "The Wood-cutters," "The Meeting with a Moscow Acquaintance" and his first long and well-rounded story "The Cossacks" followed one another in quick succession.

The period in which Count Tolstoy makes his *debut* as an author is the most important period in the History of Russian Literature. What the neo-romantic movement is to England and the *Sturm-and-Drang Leit* is to Germany, this period is to Russia; and Dostoyefsky, Gogolj and Turgenieff are in the estimation of their countrymen what Byron, Shelley and Coleridge are in the estimation of England; Gœthe, Schiller and Heine are in the estimation of Germany; and Hugo, Lamartine and Musset in the estimation of France. After a great deal of floundering and flouncing Russia had at last found herself. She boldly struck off the fetters of Pseudo-Byronism and Pseudo-Schillerism and resolutely dipped her pen into the blood-drops of the serf and the exile. All true literature with the ring of genuineness in it must be

self-regulated and self-evolved. While drawing its nourishment from the curcumambient atmosphere, it must draw its sap from the soil and must live its own life. Imitation literature is at best second-rate literature.

Time will not permit me to offer a detailed criticism of the various works of Tolstoy, for my subject is Tolstoy the Man. But as I may not revert to the subject again, I might as well notice here some of the salient points of Tolstoy the literary artist, concluding with an extract from Matthew Arnold whose critical acumen is a sufficient guarantee for the soundness of his remarks.

In the first place, then, the dominant note of Tolstoy's works is about the Self and the Inner Life; his second characteristic is horror of war and love of peace; his third characteristic is hatred of cant and platitude however decorously tricked up; his fourth characteristic is hearty contempt of the so-called culture and the so-called civilisation, an ardent enthusiasm for country life, rural pleasures and rural pursuits; and to crown them all, his abounding humanity, burning zeal for the cause of democracy and the cause of liberty—democracy and liberty never attainable according to him without the liberation of the soul. In the whole range of literature it would be hard to find an author surpassing him in human interest at once so intense and massive. That is exactly what Matthew Arnold has said in his own way in the following lines:—"The Slav nature, or at any rate the Russian nature as it shows itself in the Russian novels, seems marked by an extreme sensitiveness, a consciousness most quick and acute both for what the man's self is experiencing, and also for what others in contact with him are thinking and feeling. In a nation full of life, but young, and newly in contact with an old and powerful civilisation, this sensitiveness and self-consciousness are prompt to appear * * * The Russian man of letters finds relief to his sensitiveness in letting his perceptions have perfectly free play, and recording their reports with perfect fidelity. The sincereness with which the reports are given has even something childlike and touching * * * Things and characters go as nature take, them * * * We have great sensitiveness, subtlety and finesse addressing themselves with entire disinterestedness and simplicity to the representation of human life. The Russian novelist (Count Tolstoy, above all) is thus master of a spell to which the secrets of human nature—both what is external and what is internal, gesture and manner no less than thought and feeling—willingly make themselves known". You will perhaps say: Well, but all this is realism;—to which my reply is: No

matter. I don't care. If this is realism, Shakespeare is a realist. There is realism and realism. Count Tolstoy's realism is as far removed from the provoking prudery of England as from the shocking prurience of France. Tolstoy is not Zola.

Tolstoy did not learn the full meaning of life even in the Caucasus and the horrors of war only increased his discontent. Yet the real tragedies of war he had to learn in Russia itself. The year 1853 was the year of the great Crimean War. The meteor of destruction rose dark and portentous in the horizon of Europe and cast a lurid shadow over land and sea. John Bright heard the beating of the wings of the Angel of Death from his place in Parliament and his Quaker conscience made him tremble. But not so did shrink the nations of Europe. Sebastopol was besieged. Count Tolstoy was commander of an artillery brigade and was present in every important engagement, His experiences of this dreadful siege he has described in three sketches "Sebastopol, December, 1854, May 1855, and August 1855". The story created a sensation in Russia. The Empress wept over it, and the Czar gave order to have this young man kept in view, and to remove him from his dangerous post in the Fourth Battery. Sebastopol is evacuated after eleven months of rigorous siege. Tolstoy also leaves the battle field, and after acting for a time as an imperial courier, bids adieu to the army, having seen three years of arduous service. In the words of his biographer; "It was the most important period of his life; it brought latent thoughts to maturity, it increased his love for the common man, and his horror of war. It gave him a chance to see humanity at its best and at its worst; he had helped many a man to die, and that gave him an increased desire to live. He seemed to have had a glimpse of the most secret recesses of men's hearts, and in learning to know others, he learned to know himself. He had not as yet a philosophy of life but he was feeling after it. In the chaos of war he came near the true source of peace; laurels, too, he gained, upon a field on which the sword had been supplanted by the pen which henceforth was to be his only weapon".

(To be Continued).

KAMAKHYA NATH MITRA.

HE GOT HIS REWARD: A STORY.

BY MR. JOHN OWEN SURRAO.

RUGMINI, the bright-eyed girl of the village, lived with her mother in their ancestral home, a *Nalukettu*—one of those curiously built houses so commonly found in Malabar, orthodox in structure and with no pretence at having copied modern ideals of house-building. She lost her father when she was barely ten and, being poor in circumstances, was not yet married although she was nearing "sweet sixteen." An uncommon thing this, for a Hindu girl. Custom demanded a girl to be wedded directly she entered her teens. For some days past, despite her efforts to please her mother, she was unable to hide the tinge of sadness that deprived her perfect features of their symmetry and drove the radiant color of freshness from her countenance, once so cheerful and captivating. Her mother noticed this but she dared not discuss the cause with her daughter fearing it might be a delicate matter. It was the middle of March and the heat was intensley depressing, rendering grief all the more unbearable. Her mother had gone to the nearest bazaar to fetch the wherewithal for their evening meal. A man neared the house and unceremoniously handed her a letter and was gone. Rugmini perused the missive and a groan escaped her lips. "Has it come to this?" she involuntarily said. Distraught in mind she repaired to the grove of trees at the end of their compound (they were serpent-worshippers and had a grove dedicated to the serpent God) and there having torn the letter to pieces she gave vent to her feelings confident of security in the loneliness of the grove. "Oh wretched girl that I am to fall thus into the hands this aged villain? What can I, poor frail girl that I am, do to avert this dire misfortune? Would that I could defend myself against the overtures of this rich and influential man. Ah! that house yonder and this shady grove—scenes of my childhood, would I see them again? To-morrow I may be in the clutches of that tyrant. Oh God! my brain reels. In this wretched world Death would be sweeter". Hardly had Rugmini turned her footsteps homewards when a young man who was perched on the top of one of the trees, and who, hidden from her view, had seen and heard al!, descended and picked up the fragments of the letter and arranged them on the ground for perusal. At the sight of the writing he started and when he finished perusal the color

that came to his face was indicative, not of surprise, but of shame and anger. The missive ran as follows:—

"Rugmini, you have slighted all my attempts hitherto. I cannot bear it. If you do not yield, you will be brought to my house to-night by force and I will wed you to-morrow against your will. Govind."

* * * *

That evening when the sun had gone down in all its glory, Rugmini felt regretfully that with it her glory too was about to fade, that the sunshine of her countenance would no more brighten her childhood's home and that her poor aged mother would be a wreck when the golden orb of day now sinking in the west rose again the next morn. Mother and daughter had sat to finish their *athazham* (supper). Rugmini was scarce able te swallow a morsel of food, griefand anxiety having choked her, and consequently silence reigned in the house for neither spoke. They had hardly finished, when footsteps were heard in the verandah and Rugmini was startled. She thought the worst had arrived, but her fears were assuaged when she beheld a young girl precipitately enter their house and crouch in one of the corners of the room. Before questions could be put the strange girl with tearful eye and in broken words opened a tale of how she was put in hot pursuit by some ruffians and prayed for shelter and protection for the night under their roof. Those in distress are easily moved, and Rugmini and mother being even otherwise compassionate the permission was cheerfully accorded and all retired early to rest, but Rugmini could never sleep. The horrors of the impending catastrophe the shame and the disgrace that awaited her—all these were spectres that kept her eyes wide open. The wildest fears, suspense and grief precipitated a distressful sweating and she tossed over her bed restlessly. Midnight had passed. There was a loud rap at the door and a demand to open it, and immediately one of the inmates opened it. "Was it Janaki, the strange girl or her mother" thought Rugmini. Suddenly the thought flashed across her mind. Janaki was a spy and she had come under false pretences to aid the tyrant to facilitate her abduction. Oh! that she had not harboured this serpent in her room! The thought sent her into a dead faint. A scuffle was heard and one of the men cried "caught" "caught" and then a hasty departure of the intruders.

* * *

The rich and influential man who had hired these men to abduct Rugmini was anxiously waiting for the return of the party. A cry of joy escaped his lips when he found his men bringing a struggling girl into his room where he suffered a light to burn but dimly.

"Ah" said Govind "you proud little cat, you trifled with me; you scorned my money, my influence, my all. What say you now? You never expected such a warm reception!"

"I am foiled, I am powerless" faintly uttered the girl "but spare me, I pray, the shame of hearing your invectives in the presence of your menials."

"You yield then, after all, proud Rugmini?"

"I do."

"You can all go now" said Govind to his men "your reward will come tomorrow."

The men retired and barred the door behind them.

"Trim that lamp" said the girl in rather an imperious tone.

"What, Rugmini, are you mad?"

"Not I, but you" replied the girl and putting her hand to the lamp she brought it almost to a blaze "look at me now, well and carefully, look at this scar on my neck. Know you not who I am? Do you want more proofs?"

Govind fell into his seat as if struck by lightning "My God! my God! Whom do I see, how has this happened?"

"Enough" said the girl "you are spotted. Will you promise to leave this place tomorrow, or, shall I expose you? Which would you prefer?"

"Suppose I deny all"

"Will you? then look at this paper. Is it not your writing. Do you deny now"

"Oh God, I promise to go."

"And to give me all what you have earned hitherto for am I not your only child."

Shame and remorse, made Govind promise.

* * *

Next morning Rugmini received the following note:—

"If you will come to the grove this noon, you will know how you escaped from the clutches of that man whom you dreaded."

Punctually at twelve Rugmini repaired to the grove and was astonished to find Janaki—the strange girl of the previous day—under the shade of a big tree. Her first impulse was to flee away from the girl whom she thought to be a spy, fearing this was a second trap laid to capture her, but plucking up courage she asked:

"Janaki, how comes it that you are here"?

"I have come to tell you that my father, Govind, whom you

dreaded so much yesterday has left the place this morning with a promise not to return."

"Your father, Janaki, is he, and why did you come home last evening?"

"To save the honor of a girland a girl of your stamp".

"And how did you know"?

"Rugmini, I have a hobby for climbing trees, and see this scar on my neck, I got it from a fall when I was barely twelve."

"Yes I noticed that big scar last night when you were with me, But do you climb trees still?"

""And why can't I ?" so saying she pulled off her false hair, her *Mukkuthi* (nose-ring) her *rowkai* (Jacket) and stood before Rugmini —a handsome sprightly young man of two and twenty. Rugmini was amazed.

"Listen" said he "yesterday from the top of that tree I heard the grief-laden outpourings of your heart and saw you scatter the pieces of this letter (producing the carefully stuck up paper) which my father had written. Divining all, I made up my mind to save you and disguised myself as you have seen. My father was elated when he saw his men bringing up the girl he wanted but when I showed him this scar, he was dumb-founded. He has left as I said. The men who were hired to carry you are disappointed that they didn't get their promised reward today".

" And you are disappointed" said Rugmini looking gratefully into his brave eyes "that you got no promise nor reward for your service. I have but little to give but what I have, you can readily take."

Opening his arms with a look that bespoke love more eloquently than words, he said " Would that my reward would fall into my hands."

And she fell into his arms—and they were clasped in one fond loving embrace and in the solitude their lips met—a kiss as gratitude and a kiss as reward.

" Thanks, thanks " she whispered.

" Happy day " gently he said " a good wife and a fortune to boot "

And Rugmini ran home to tell her aged mother the glad tidings.

JOHN OWEN SURRAO.

SOME ASPECTS OF LEGAL ETHICS.*

By Mr. K. G. Sesha Aiyar, B. A., B. L.

I regard it as a great distinction to be invited to deliver the Valedictory Address at the annual meeting of the Law College Association; but I must confess, that tempting as the invitation was, it was not without many searchings of the heart and considerable hesitation that I accepted it. When I remembered who the speakers on previous occasions were and their eminent qualifications to advise young students of law who were soon to go out for the practice of that noble profession, I thought I could explain the anxiety of the Secretaries of the Law College Association to secure me for this function, only on the ground that they wanted to give themselves the malicious pleasure of enjoying my discomfiture before this learned gathering; for I assured them that my performance would only be an illustration of, how not to do it. Still their irresistible insistence made me in a moment of weakness—and perhaps also vanity—to accede to their request. Once before, when the Law College Association cajoled me into presiding at one of its meetings, I had the hardihood to speak extempore, little remembering the admonition of the poet,

> A chiel's amang ye, taking notes;
> And faith, he will prent it.

Well, there was actually among the students present at that meeting a short-hand writer, who unknown to me took down everything that I said, and shortly after that meeting I had the fearful joy of seeing in cold print my remarks, which filled the modest space of nearly four columns in a local newspaper. To avoid giving my short-hand friend another opportunity of doing me a similar turn, and for other reasons, I have put in writing what I have to say. I have a painful consciousness that my address looks much like a sermon; but still I trust it will not be like the ideal sermon of the parson, who was unapproachable on week days and un-understandable on Sundays. I do not intend to lecture the students who form this Association; I do not think I ever did when I was a teacher, and I do not certainly intend to do so now. I always feel the spirit of confraternity when among them and if I presume to give them some advice, it is because one of the recognized functions of a lawyer is to give advice. They need not be afraid I would charge them. Gentlemen of the Law College, most

* A Valedictory Address delivered before the Law College Association, Trivandrum.

of you will soon turn to the practice of the law as your profession. The course you have undergone in the Law College has given you a good grounding in the underlying principles of the law; and in due course the coveted certificate of admission to the bar will be given you by the bodies appointed to test your knowledge of the law. At the very outset I should like to caution you that however highly educated you may be and however thorough your knowledge of the law, you should never suppose there is no further need for study. A lawyer to be successful must be during his whole professional life a student. Law is not the last guess of the Supreme Court as a wit has facetiously described it. It is a Science; though not an exact Science; and every case will present new opportunities for applying old principles. Constantly changing conditions of life and business are bringing forward new questions, and this tendency will continue, so long as the human race continues to advance. Lawyers to-day are called upon to solve questions which never confronted their predecessors at the bar. The lawyer who fails to keep abreast of the times by careful and constant study will soon be outstripped in the race for professional honours by those who are students and devote their spare time to the study of the current legal literature and the reports of the current cases. If you read current legal literature, you will soon realize how the sphere of activity in the realm of our profession is daily increasing. By the mastery of general principles, you may be able to do something in most branches of the law; but there remains a great mass of learning on each question, and of this you must not be ignorant, if you wish to rise above mediocrity. To be expert in every branch of the law has now ceased to be a possibility. No doubt all of us have a sort of subconscious prejudice in favour of the all-round man, but under modern conditions, the genuine article in any department—law included—it is impossible to come across. Asks Disraeli: "Are the original powers of genius, then, limited to a single art, and even to departments of that art? May not men of genius plume themselves with the vainglory of universality? Cicero failed in poetry, Addison in oratory, Voltaire in comedy and Johnson in tragedy. Such instances abound and demonstrate an important truth in the history of genius that we cannot, however we may incline, enlarge the natural extent of our genius any more than we can add a cubit to our stature. We may force it into variations, but in multiplying mediocrity or in doing what others can do we add nothing to genius." If there be a singleness in genius as Disraeli calls it, how much more shall the average lawyer find his powers

unequal to the task of attaining excellence in the many and diverse fields of his profession? Perforce the modern lawyer who would be foremost in his profession must specialize; but every lawyer who would not be a failure in his profession, must continue his study. Civilization in its advance brings more and more facts upon which the legal principles must be brought to bear. A lawyer must have greater capacity than others of mastering facts. This is the age of Electricity and we are living in more haste than ever before—and the lawyer must be prompt and ready. In all professions the standard is advancing. The lawyer should also advance with equal strides. Every student of history—and every lawyer should be such—knows that in the long and arduous struggle for liberty in England and on the continent of Europe and America, the lawyer was foremost in every movement to advance the rights of man. The profession of the law exists for the good of the public; and the lawyers have a monopoly of no unimportant part of the 'public utilities.' The lawyer as lawyer exists by the grace of the state in order that he may do public service; and that he may do such service efficiently, that the profession of the law may retain the high position so long retained in the advancement of public welfare, the lawyer's education must be thorough, and he should so acquire a knowledge of legal principles that it might become almost intuitive.

In beginning your practice, you will probably be glad to get legal business of any honorable kind, whether criminal or civil. A criminal case may give you an opportunity to display your knowledge and ability, and by that means secure other lines of business; but as a rule criminal practice is not the most desirable. This is no reflection on those who engage in that line; but the associations connected with it are neither attractive nor beneficial as a rule; and the criminal law which is exceedingly simple in its nature and the rules relating to which are few, does not afford much scope for the development of a good lawyer. Of course, no branch of knowledge comes amiss to the criminal lawyer, and a successful pracitioner of the criminal law must have great general knowledge and good insight into human nature; it may however be accepted without demur that if you are a good lawyer in other branches of the profession, you will generally be able to make as good a defence as can be made when your services are needed in a criminal case.

Speaking of defending criminal cases reminds me of an important duty that you may be called upon to discharge in the practice of the criminal law. Though in Travancore we have not yet been given the

privilege of trial by jury—and I may parenthetically remark I have in another capacity strenuously fought for the privilege—it is now almost a truism to say that to be tried by an impartial jury is alike the protection of the innocent and the right of the guilty ; and no one with a sense of justice or the instincts of humanity could wish that it should be otherwise. It will be your duty, if you practice in places where trial by jury is allowed to secure an impartial jury for the trial of your prisoner. There seems to be an idea that the proper method of securing such a jury is to challenge every one who has heard anything about the facts or formed any opinion, however slight, upon the belief that his information is correct. To do so, it seems to me, is the worst possible policy. There is no surer way of producing a conviction in the mind of a juror that the prisoner is guilty than to excuse every one who has heard anything about the facts. The juror that is accepted soon learns that the defence lawyer believes that every one who knows anything about the case knows that the accused is guilty. As each accepted juror is added, this impression grows stronger, and when the jury is completed the jurors are naturally under the belief that it was because of their ignorance of the facts that they did not like the others believe the defendant guilty. There is no reason for holding that one who is capable of receiving mental impressions conditioned upon the truth of the facts stated, would not be a fair and honest juror; and you may be quite sure that one who forms no mental picture from a statement of the facts which at the time that they were published there was no reason to doubt, will be too dull and lacking in intelligence to form a just conclusion from the evidence let in court.

I shall not dwell further on your mental equipment. I shall only ask you to remember that law is the distinguishing factor of civilization and a thorough knowledge of well-established legal principles and diligence in finding out what may not for the time be well known and in keeping pace with the developments of legal knowledge necessitated by the advance of civilization, are necessary for success. No doubt in your career you will make mistakes which will perhaps even cause bitter humiliation and disappointment. This has been the lot of every lawyer; but if you are of the proper stuff, every mistake and disappointment will tend to strengthen and better fit you for the practice of your profession. You remember the opening lines of the "Ladder of St. Augustine."

St. Augustine, well hast thou said
That of our vices we can frame

A ladder, if we will but tread
Beneath our feet each deed of shame.

Perhaps you have read Tennyson's *Gareth and Lynette.* We read that when Sir Gareth, "Victor of the bridges and the ford and Knight of Arthur" found himself on his back in the field, he burst into laughter. That is the proper frame of mind in which you should receive your defeats. You should not allow yourselves to be borne down by them.

You know that without conflict, the brute nature alone will re-remain; the man, the possible god, will vanish. To save us from sinking to brute level we are endowed with elements that rouse soul-powers and call for strenuous effort. All rebuffs and stings of the world should act as impulses to higher progress. "What is our failure here but a triumph's evidence for the fulness of the days" asks the poet. "We fall to rise, are baffled to fight better; sleep to wake". In such light should you regard failure and humiliation, and make them stepping stones to success and honour. Among modern legal names, none is greater than those of Lord Herschel, Lord Russel of Killowen and Mr. Gully. In their early career at the bar, they met with such disappointment in their circuit that they almost despaired of being able to rise in the profession if they remained in England; and they therefore resolved to go out to the Colonies. Fortunately, however, they did not carry out their resolution; but courageously fought for success at the bar of England and as you know, one rose to be the Lord Chancellor, another the Lord Chief Justice, and the third Speaker of the House of Commons. You must have heard of the early struggles of Eldon and Erskine; and I daresay you have read how patiently Mr. Sinha—the first Indian Member of the Viceroy's Executive Council—had to wait before fortune smiled on him.

I shall now turn to another part of your equipment. As lawyers each of you will become an officer of the courts, an essential part of the administration of the law; and it is equally your duty and interest to be a friend of the court and a supporter of the law. Not a friend of the court in the sense of personal intimacy with judges; but in showing honour and respect which is justly due to the courts as constituting the judicial system of the country and the instruments for effecting justice. The profession of the law is a learned and liberal profession. Every member owes a debt to the profession, and the first part of that debt is to support its dignity. In maintaining the reign of law and justice, the lawyer has a very important function to discharge. The work of the lawyer is work really done in the interests of justice and

such work is permanent work; for the stability of society depends largely upon it. It is by law and justice that we maintain whatever is worth maintaining in our civilization. Every body has heard of the last will of Fredrick the Great; "*Si le meurs durant le guerre je Veux que cet empire soit administre avec la justice, la sagesse et la force,*" "If I die during the war—I will that this Empire be administered with justice, with wisdom and with force." Bonaparte said: "The grandest monument I shall ever have is the Code Napoleon," not remember his Austerlitz or Marengo or Jena. In the great work of progress justice is the chief instrument and the lawyer as an officer of justice has a great function to discharge. Society ranks the lawyer as a gentleman and it is the duty of every gentleman upon entering the ranks of this noble and honorable profession to firmly resolve that never shall the honour or dignity of the profession suffer through any act of his and throughout his entire professional career he should strive to carry out this resolution. Each member of the legal fraternity should strive to maintain at a very high level the standard of professional ethics. The expression professional ethics denotes that code of unwritten rules for the government of members of the legal profession in their intercourse and dealings with the courts, the public and with each other, which through immemorial usage has become obligatory The high importance of a knowledge of professional ethics as an indispensable qualification of the lawyer is well illustrated by a recent American ruling by the Supreme Court of South Dakota—*Danforth, V. Egan.* In that case the question that the court had to decide was whether an attorney who had been disbarred for an offence against professional ethics should be allowed to appear and act as a state attorney to which office he had been, subsequent to the disbarment proceedings, elected at the polls. The court said:—"It is the contention of appellant that being 'learned in the law' he meets the requirement of the constitution and is entitled to hold the office in question. We have already shown that this phrase 'learned in the law' is really mere surplusage as it is controlled by the more limited term "attorney" yet we will consider briefly this phrase and see whether the appellant could bring himself thereunder in view of the judgment of this court in the disbarment proceedings To be learned in the law one certainly must be learned in all those branches of the law which have at all times been recognized as essential in order to qualify one to practice as an attorney and to be admitted as such. He must not only be versed in the books of law

such as those on contracts, torts, evidence, domestic relation, etc., but *it is even more important that he be well based upon those rules of conduct which as a lawyer and practitioner should control his relations with his fellow-lawyers, his clients, witnesses and jurors in court, and the public in general.* Knowledge of this branch of the law, commonly known as 'legal ethics,' has long been recognized as the most important qualification for one who is to be intrusted with the sacred duties of an attorney-at-law, and our present statute recognizes this fact and makes legal ethics one of the branches to be considered in passing upon the qualification of one seeking admission to practice. This court has by its judgment held that the appellant has violated many of the ethical laws which should control the conduct of an attorney. It appears, therefore, that prior to such decision this appellant had done many things which showed either gross ignorance of, or wilful disregard of the laws of legal ethics. When this fact has been judicially determined as in this case against this appellant he will not be heard to claim that he knew his duties and the ethical rules which should have controlled his actions and intentionally disregarded the same, but the law in its kindness will conclusively presume that he performed those acts which caused his disbarment in ignorance of his duties and of the rules of ethics and will therefore say that no matter how well versed he may be in many branches of the law, yet being ignorant in its most important branch, he is not learned in the law."

Here is a judicial declaration in favor of "legal ethics" as "the most important" branch of the law. In Rabbins on American Advocacy, the author in discussing the "Inviolability of the Code of Ethics" says, "The statutes in most states provide that a license to practice law authorizes the advocate to appear in all the courts whithin the state and there to practise as an attorney and counsellor at law, according to the laws and customs thereof, for and during his good behavior in said practice. By the term 'laws and customs' of practice is meant the principles of the code of ethics as well as the rules of court provided for the purpose of regulating the local practice of the law."

I shall not deal in detail with the various aspects of this important subject of professional ethics. I shall, for fear of transgressing the limits of time set for me, state very briefly the important rules of conduct regulating a lawyer's relation to the courts, the public and his fellow lawyers. As regards the lawyer's duty to the courts, we should remember that lawyers are officers of the court, and are, therefore, subject to its direction and discipline, and they are also burdened with

the duty of assisting the court in maintaining its honour and dignity. They are ministers in the temple of justice, bound by a solemn pledge to support the laws of the land and to preserve the robes of justice pure and unsullied. There can be no higher calling than rendering assistance in the maintenance of law and order and no duty can be more sacred than preserving the honour and dignity of the profession. That the streams of justice may remain pure and undefiled there must be instilled into the minds of the people, respect for the law and confidence in the courts; and he who strives to maintain that respect and confidence is doing a work, which cannot be too highly estimated. The habit of respect for judicial tribunals and of deference for their decisions, should be cultivated by our profession and through our profession it will prevail among the people. It should be the rule of every lawyer never to say or do anything that will in the slightest degree throw suspicion upon the courts or that will engender distrust of the purity of the motives of the judges; and any lawyer who may wantonly work for such mischievous end is an enemy to his country and his people. Speaking of the lawyer's duty to the public, an American writer says: "It is the lawyer who has stepped into the breach on every occasion of national peril. From the platform and the stump his voice has been heard and always in behalf of the cause he believed to be right; his voice has always been for liberty, for equality, for right and for justice. His voice has ever been heard pleading for peace as long as peace with honour was possible; but when there finally came the call to arms, the lawyer was the first to respond. On every battle-field he was a leader, in every council his voice was potent, in every place of danger he was present, wherever duty called, there he was found. In affairs of state his voice has always been heard in favour of wise, conservative but progressive measures. The lawyer's duty to the public is to continue in the future as in the past to be a leader in every movement calculated to advance the public interests; be first in peace and first in war; honest as a legislator, pure and upright as a Judge; to advocate those public measures that he believes to be right, and condemn those he believes to be wrong, to be a good citizen and an honest man." Apart from the general public, the lawyer owes a duty to his client. He owes entire devotion to the interests of this client, warm zeal in the maintenance and defence of his cause and the exertion of the utmost skill and ability to the end that nothing may be taken or with-held from him save by the rules of law, legally applied. Never-

theless it should be steadily borne in mind that the trust is to be performed within and not without the bounds of the law which creates it. His office does not permit, much less demand, violation of law or any manner of fraud or chicanery for the client's sake. By his retainer, he is bound to guard the interests of the client in every way consistent with his duty to himself and to the public as a good citizen. In discharging his duty to the client, the lawyer may remember that his function is essentially what Mr. Tulliver conceives it to be in the "Mill on the Floss." Law according to that estimable gentleman was a sort of cockfight in which it was the business of injured honesty, if it wanted to win, to get a game bird with the best pluck and the sharpest spurs. This was evidently Lord Esher's view too. Mr. Justice Walton has recently said that once when he was at the bar and was tamely subsiding before Lord Esher's onslaughts, that imperious Judge exclaimed, "Why don't you fight? You are quite right to fight hard. It is your duty."

I shall just say a word about a lawyer's duty to his bretbren of the bar. I have already said that every lawyer is presumed to be a gentleman, and to a gentleman true courtesy is instinctive. It is only when a lawyer forgets that he is a gentleman that he disregards the dictates of that professional courtesy which is the very ground-work of fraternal feeling among lawyers, upon the extinction of which the practice of law will cease to be a profession and degenerate into a business.

I must now draw my remarks to a close. I desire to impress upon you at the very threshold of your career in life that there is no profession in which a high-toned morality is more imperatively necessary than that of the law. The profession is certainly beset with temptations and at almost every step there are traps and pitfalls; and you can avoid them only if high moral principle is your guide. Without the legal profession society cannot go on and if it is to be potent for good and not for evil, the lawyers' dealings must be guaranteed by the highest considerations of good faith and honour, rectitude and integrity. Serve the profession in this spirit, subordinating your own interest to the holy obligation that the noble profession to which you intend to be called lays on you, putting trust in the words of one of the greatest masters of English song.

> Man may with fit ambition conceive
> The greatest blessings and the brightest honours
> Appointed for him if he can achieve them
> The right and noble way.

K. G. SESHA AIYAR.

PATRIOTISM.

By the Editor.

"The honour of a country depends much more on removing its faults than on boasting of its qualities"—Mazzini.

OUR readers may remember that in one of the previous issues of our Journal we pointed out that the two primary requisites for Nation-building are the subjective element of Patriotism and the objective factor, Organization. A number of other requisites may be enumerated, but, in the last analysis, they will be found to depend for their effective application and success on these two most fundamental pre-requisites. As we have heretofore remarked, Organisation supplies the framework and Patriotism the motive power of the National machinery and it is idle to expect the latter to work in the absence of either. Very often do we talk of Japan's rise as if that were the result of some sudden explosion of national energy, long pent up for want of proper channels of escape; but do we, at the same time, realize, to their full extent, the force, the ardour, the intensity of the Patriotic passion which that nation, to a man, has silently brought to bear on all their public endeavours and the elaborate care, minuteness and circumspection with which they have organized themselves for the grand work of national reconstruction? To change slightly the figure employed by Herbert Spencer in treating of a kindred subject, there is no political alchemy whereby we can get golden national results out of leaden individual instincts. Reserving Organisation for a subsequent paper, here we shall take up Patriotism for our consideration.

It seems not a little singular that while Patriotism has evoked the most enthusiastic admiration of some sections of the world's thinkers, it has also received unqualified condemnation at the hands of certain others. To cite but two instances of each class,

Goldsmith sings:

"Such is the patriot's boast, where'er we roam—
His first best country ever is at home".

And Addison is still more emphatic:

* * * What pity is it
That we can die but once to serve our country?"

As coming under the second class, Tertullian among the ancients and Tolstoy among the moderns have stoutly refused to bow before this popular fetish. Says the former: "We recognize one Commonwealth,

the World", thereby indicating that Patriotism or the idea of belonging to a particular commonwealth or nation is a narrow and illiberal kind of feeling which ought not to be cultivated. Tolstoy is even stronger in his denunciation. In his deeply interesting essay on *Patriotism and Government* he fulminates in the following strain:—"I have already several times expressed the thought that in our day the feeling of patriotism is an unnatural irrational and harmful feeling, and a cause of a great part of the ills from which mankind is suffering; and that, consequently, this feeling should not be cultivated, as is now being done, but should, on the contrary, be suppressed and eradicated by all means available to rational men". He adds later on, "It would, therefore, seem obvious that patriotism as a feeling is bad and harmful, and as a doctrine is stupid. For it is clear that if each people and each State considers itself the best of peoples and States, they all live in a gross and harmful delusion". Surely one and the same feeling could not have called forth such diametrically opposed views and ranged the cultured minds in two hostile camps. Even *a priori* from the intellectual position of the parties concerned one may be led to suspect whether this is not a repetition of the instance of the two knights in the fable going to fight each other on the colour of a shield. A closer examination, however, reveals that Patriotism, like the Sphinx of old, has two aspects, one attractive and the other repulsive. It may be viewed from two entirely different stand-points, thus furnishing us with a key to explain the disparity of the opinions entertained in this important matter. From the point of view of the individual and of the nation to which he belongs it shines as a rare jewel in the crown of virtues. It has been the inspiration of poets, the theme of orators, the sacred fire which ceaselessly burnt in the hearts of heroes and urged them on to the glory of "high immortal deeds." It has been an ever-ennobling influence which lifted man from the sordid conventionalities of selfish life into the purer and serener atmosphere of altruistic work. Noble though the feeling is in this aspect, it loses all its attractiveness when viewed from the position of *other* nations or communities whose interests come to clash with those of the Patriot's land and who suffer not only from the mistaken exclusiveness of the Patriot but also from his misdirected ambition of military glory and territorial aggrandisement. On its peaceful, defensive side Patriotism is a virtue; on its militant, offensive side it is a vice. In the one case it is constructive and in the other, destructive. The virtue of Patriotism is a mean between two extreme vices; absence of communal, social

or political feeling or instinct on the one hand and the over-abundant presence of it on the other. As in the case of individuals, the virtue of self-preservation lies between the extreme vices of self-destruction and selfishness, so among nations too Patriotism, which makes for national preservation, must be held a virtue so long as there is danger, present or prospective, threatening it. Doubtless with the arrival of the millennium,

> "The time when brotherhood shows stronger,
> Than the narrow bounds which now distract the world,
> When the cannons roar and trumpets blare no longer
> And the ironclad rusts and battleflags are furled",

Patriotism may sink into comparative insignificance, but till that far-off golden time arrives, we shall have to sail with the Poet and not with the Prophet and the Visionary—albeit their prophecy and vision may have all the glamour and witchery of an exalted moral ideal about them—and hold that relatively to our own times Patriotism or the National feeling is an indispensable condition of national progress.

Patriotism being a virtue of such commanding importance in the present attitude of the nations, which is but one of armed neutrality, it becomes imperative to consider whether we, who aspire to be a nation or our forefathers possess it or ever possessed it in any appreciable degree whatsoever. Self-analysis, it will be conceded, is difficult and unpalatable, particularly if such examination tends to prick the bubble of our vanity or self-esteem, or blur ever so little the rosy-coloured picture we have formed of ourselves. This difficulty is all the more increased by the imminent risk of popularity one is running when he has the temerity to undertake the unpleasant task of probing a national defect; for it is notorious how easily many of our preachers and platform speakers leap into popularity and win admiring plaudits from an Indian audience all by the trick of some stray allusion to the vanished glory of Bharatavarsha or to the names of the great ones who have figured in the long roll of her legendary lore or history. Distasteful as the question is we have still to seriously answer it. Look around you with vigilant eyes or scan ever so much the checquered history of our land, the distressingly mournful fact is brought home to your minds that in no instance have the people in general, the masses, the dumb millions, been animated by this noble passion. In no instance have they been driven to sink their petty differences in view or in the presence of a common danger and linked together in the indissoluble bonds of national fellowship. Nor

will your search after individuals, within whose bosom the flame of patriotism glowed and burnt up the dross of selfish instincts, be crowned with anything but partial success. Here and there a few individuals may have risen to the laborious heights of public sense or duty. But a few oases scattered at long distances from one another can scarcely turn a burning Sahara into a smiling garden of beauty and pleasure. The political instinct, the sense of public duty, the love of one's country or nation above the love of one's sweet self, should be felt by every sect in the nation and by almost every individual in each sect. Every fibre in the National Organism should feel its thrill. Only then can we hope to be a nation in the full sense of the term; only then can we think of having entered political manhood. But what a spectacle does India present? Barring Northern India which is astir with a new spirit, a spirit which in the fulness of time is bound to grow from more to more, the peninsular India is still steeped in political lethargy. Each individual, at least in this corner of India, is bent after securing his own interests *exclusively* and is entirely oblivious of the fact that he owes a duty to the society in which he is born and of which he is a member. He devotes all his time to the acquisition of wealth and devotes all his wealth to the enjoyment of selfish pleasures. *I* and its inflexives are the only personal pronouns known to his vocabulary; anything beyond these is as good as non-existent to him. *I* is the magnificent pivot round which every consideration must revolve. Take those amongst us who hunger after western knowledge, flock to the public schools and emerge with University honours. How few of these devote their time and energy for the public good? Government service claims the lion's share of these and Law, which is no less fascinating a pursuit, absorbs the major portion of the remnant, leaving but an infinitesimally small residue for the other avocations of life not excluding the supreme service of the motherland. Rightly did Swami Abhedananda decry the degeneracy of our present day ideal. In one of his speeches he says: "And today we hold the ideals of becoming a pleader. We hold an ideal of living upon the litigation of other people and *that* is degrading." Of course Law, within limits, has a noble function to discharge, but not Law when pursued so universally by our educated classes or so exclusively as a money-making profession. Indeed pecuniary considerations have got such a strong hold of the popular imagination and have come to colour even the views of our educated brethren so thoroughly that faith in the

possibility of any one working for the public good is, to all intents and purposes, dead. They have come to look upon such an individual as a "new find", a "wonderful phenomenon," a "freak of nature's fancy," or worse still a witless fool or a hypocrite. They chaff him on his public spirit, wonder how he could be so foolish as to prate of 'public good,' 'social progress' 'national improvement' and other such equally unmeaning phrases and wind up their advice to him with the exhortation to mind his own business. The noxious spirit of selfishness has become so rooted and so rank that even the ancient funds, such as the village funds, the temple funds, the *mutt* funds, bequeathed to us by the munificence of our forefathers, have not been left untouched by its desecrating hand. Wherever we turn, the tale is one of wanton mismanagement and spoliation of public funds. Individuals or bodies in charge of such funds have everything their own way in their administration not half so much by their own cupidity as by the listlessness of the general public in exercising a wholesome restraint on the management. Public affairs, in short, have become nobody's affairs and thus have drifted on, without let or hindrance, to the most hopeless confusion imaginable.

It will therefore serve some purpose we think if we go a little into the causes which have brought matters to this sad state. Unfortunately some of these causes are extra-human and unlike the human lie beyond the scope of man's power to remedy. Nevertheless they should also be enumerated if only for the purpose of directing our energies and devising means to mitigate their results to however small an extent as possible. The very *extensiveness of the country* we inhabit has only retarded the growth of Patriotism by destroying national unity. It was the most potent cause why the homogeneity of the races was shattered; it was the means of placing people amidst diverse environments and creating in them diverse interests and aspirations; and it served moreover as a formidable barrier between province and province, class and class, preventing them from taking part in any common act of national enterprise. The exhilaration of a common victory or the incentive of a common defeat they have had no occasion to feel owing to this supreme physical obstacle. The truth of what we assert will be amply established if our readers will take the trouble of contrasting the small states of the world with the extensive ones and realize the invincible patriotism, national unity and political strength displayed by the one class and the absence of these in the other. The *fertility of the soil*, with which Nature has blessed

India, is another of the powerful natural causes which have not favoured the birth and development of Patriotism. It has not brought the inhabitants into closer contact with the soil and produced that attachment which goes by the name of "love of one's motherland." Dr. H. R. Mill writes, "It is noticeable that the patriotic spirit is strongest in those places where people are brought most intimately into relation with the land; dwellers in the mountain or by the sea, and above all the people of rugged coasts and mountainous archipelagoes, have always been renowned for love of country, while the inhabitants of fertile plains and trading communities are frequently less strongly attached to their own land." *Immensity of the population* and the *diversity of the races. castes, languages, religions*, &c, which have been the main characteristics of India throughout her history, have led also to the same result. In an overswollen society the peripheric masses detach themselves from the central ones under the stress of differing conditions and thus bring about the disruption of national unity; the same result is also attained in a society composed of heterogeneous elements such as ethnic, linguistic, religious, &c. If the society suffers from overgrowth, the feeling of patriotism becomes vague and attenuated; if it suffers from internal divisions, the feeling is killed by conflict of interests. India has had to pay the penalty for the combined operation of both the evils named above. The *instability of governments*, due to successive waves of invasion had also it share of influence in the practical denationalization of India. So rapid were the succession of governments and the change of dynasties and in cases where the government and dynasties were comparatively stable and long-enduring so sudden was the change of rulers that people naturally came to look upon them with evident unconcern. These political vicissitudes which swept over the surface had hardly any influence on the lower strata of society. The still waters underneath were by no means perturbed by the storms which raged above. In course of time the people came to entertain the comfortable idea "Governments come and go, but we people go on for ever and so need not move our little finger to set up a government or stand in its defence". How could Patriotism sprout in a soil such as this? Apart from the instability of the established governments in our land their *nature* too contributed not a little to the deplorable lack of public spirit characteristic of our people. The Hindu and the Muhammadan Sovereignty which preceded the English rule in India were tainted in two different ways. The idea of divine right of

kings lifted the former sovereignty clean above the plane of human criticism and surrounded it with a halo of sanctity; while excessive over-centralisation of political functions crippled the powers of the people in the latter and left them little room for initiative in any public undertaking. Individual, in both systems, dwindled into too unimportant a factor and incentive to action was to a great extent wanting. The *influence of a religious and philosophic system* which, whatever its merits are from other points of view, has held before mankind detachment from the affairs of this world as the surest way to salvation or self-realization, must also be held answerable for the unparalleled listlessness in political matters. At the altar of spiritual welfare, idealized by intellects of surpassing force and brilliance who would ever grumble to sacrifice transitory mundane interests? As a result, passivity was more praised and sought after than activity and speculation was carried to the verge of emasculating a nation and rendering them unfit for the battle of life in this world. Altogether an atmosphere was created which was anything but congenial to the growth of patriotic feeling, a feeling which is of the earth earthy and could not therefore have appealed to their high-strung spiritual natures. The *innate conservatism* of the Indian races which impels them to run in fixed grooves, irrespective of the progress around, must also have contributed its quota of effect. It is true that in many concerns of life man is conservative by natural temperament; but this native conservatism has, in our case, been greatly intensified by special circumstances. For instance, the iron rules of caste or *Varna Dharma*—however much the higher classes may break their spirit though sticking to their- letterhave still some force with the vast majority of the lower orders and the members of these classes stick to their own professions and beaten tracks of duty and dare not cast their eyes beyond them. Active participation in public affairs is a novel duty with many in their midst; and there are not wanting men who consider such participation as impertinence pure and simple. They might even quote the instances of their forefathers who had lived happy lives in spite of their not having had anything to do with public matters and ask triumphantly why the so-called public spirit be made such an idol of? No amount of preaching and persuasion will divert one of this class from the accustomed path he is treading to a new career of public usefulness. The *absence of certain mental and moral requisites* necessary for co-operation must also have had its effect in not developing Patriotism in the Indian mind. To single out but two

out of many peculiarities, a superstitious frame of mind instead of a scientific attitude and a want of mutual sympathy and comradeship which mark out our masses and also a good many of our educated classes are scarcely the materials out of which a strong commensense patriotism could be got. It is trite to observe that mental faculties that are not called forth into exercise become weaker and weaker in course of time and may possibly disappear altogether by long disuse. Even so in the case of Patriotism, the mental and moral qualities, necessary for its growth, had become nearly atrophied by want of exercise. Co-operation being absent, there was no means whereby Patriotism or collective egoism could be developed in our society. *Absence of training and education*, at home, in the school and in the wider field of society inculcating by precept and example that a man has two duties to discharge, viz., (i) to himself and (ii) to the society to which he belongs, is another cause why our men are not sufficiently imbued with national consciousness. In our society, social and political Organisations, the training-ground wherein the individual is taught to take a true perspective of the good of the body politic, are conspicuous by their absence. If an individual could be so trained as to sacrifice some portion of his interests for the good of the association or club of which he is a member, he might be depended on for risking a larger stake when the affairs of a nation demand of him the performance of a particular duty. The history of our joint enterprises—of our associations, societies, clubs, &c.,—gives us food for sad rumination. It is one unvarying record of slackness, indifference, weakness and failure all along the line. If this side of our lives establishes anything at all it establishes beyond doubt that we are still lacking in public spirit, social duty or political responsibility. And for this we shall have to thank, in a measure, the system of training and education which has been in vogue in our midst for many centuries past. The foregoing are some of the causes which have been working together for a long period and have at last succeeded in producing a practical disintegration of our society as a political unit. One inert mass of humanity, a vast debris of political materials, lies wrapt in torpor, unarranged and unused.

Here is the field for our leaders to work in, the starting point for the political race we aspire to run. Let them begin at the bottom lest the superstructure they try to raise tumble down for want of support. Their foremost duty is to create among the people the binding cement of patriotism, to unify their ideal, their standpoint and their method of work,

to transform incoherence into coherence, discord into harmony, hatred into love and weakness into strength. Theirs is the duty to teach by precept and example, at home, in the school and in social circles that each individual owes duties to his country and his people as well as to himself and his family; theirs is the duty to impress on each person that a man would be judged not by the amount of wealth or number of progeny he leaves behind him, nor by the intellectual grasp and critical acumen he displays in detecting errors in other's reasonings or flaws in other's deeds, nor by the amount of noise he made in his life-time, nor even by the saintly character of a passive type he bore then, but by the quantity of work he has done for his fellowmen; theirs is the duty to manfully throw their weight into the scale of modernising India against terrible odds, to set their faces against superstitious beliefs and practices in any form and to infuse a scientific spirit into all that we think, speak and do; theirs is the duty not to run with the current for momentary applause but to stem the tide of retrogressive movements, which has set in as a part of a wider movement of violent reaction against western ideals and which has unfortunately gained a foothold here at present, and call upon our brethren betimes to direct their vision to India's pregnant future and not to her past, however glorious that past may be; theirs is the duty to exhort our people to follow in the footsteps of Japan and China and breaking the shell of self-sufficiency try to gather knowledge from other countries, and utilize it in the cause of their motherland; theirs is the duty again to weaken by all possible means the hold of caste† which has outlived its date, if the Indian society should become a political power to reckon with and to fuse the different sections into a compact irresistible mass. Theirs is the duty, in short, to be *patriotic* themselves‡ and instil *patriotism* into others; for in that single virtue is summed up all the virtues pertaining to public life.

† It is quite late in the day to justify the "dividing insolences" of caste on the economic principle of division of labour or on the assumption of Aura and other such mystical forces.

‡ Whatever may be the differences of opinion entertained regarding the origin and nature of the Congress debacle at Surat none will doubt that it was mostly due to a lack of patriotism in some at least of our public men. If a sense of duty to the nation had prevailed over the sense of self-importance a few had been suffering from, we would have been spared the sad and unseemly spectacle of personal considerations and selfish passions wrecking a great Assembly.